A CONFERENCE

WITH CERTAIN

MINISTERS AND ELDERS OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,

ON THE SUBJECT OF

THE MODERATORSHIP

OF THE

NEXT GENERAL ASSEMBLY;

TO WHICH IS ADDED

AN ADDRESS

ON THE SAME SUBJECT, TO THE CHURCH AT LARGE.

BY

THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D. LL.D. & F.R.S.E.

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH,
AND CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF FRANCE.

GLASGOW:

WILLIAM COLLINS 155, INGRAM STREET;

OLIVER & BOYD, WM. WHYTE & CO., AND WM. OLIPHANT & SON,
EDINBURGH; W. F. WAKEMAN, AND WM. CURRY, JUN.,
& CO., DUBLIN; WHITTAKER & CO., HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.,
AND SIMPKIN & MARSHALL, LONDON.

MDCCCXXXVII.

PREFACE.

This Pamphlet would have appeared sooner, but for a circumstance which led me to suspend it for some time; and the possibility was, that, during that suspense, other reasons might have transpired to supersede the necessity for a publication altogether.

The friends of Church Extension in Glasgow, sent me a very earnest representation of the dangers, which might accrue to their cause, from any further agitation of the controversy respecting the Moderatorship of the next General Assembly. I was not sure that they were right; nor did I altogether participate in their strong and somewhat indefinite apprehensions—yet, I was unwilling to incur the slightest temporary hazard of inflicting any mischief on a cause, whose safety alone it was, that ever led me to feel the least interest on the question of the Moderatorship.

But shortly after adopting this resolution, Dr. Dickson's second letter of the 29th of December reached me; and I then called on my friends in Glasgow to consider the dilemma in which I was placed by it. By his first letter he had conjured me not to publish, and that too on the very ground which was urged by the Extensionists in the West of Scotland—the great mischief that might thereby accrue to their undertaking. And then when, by the force of this consideration, silence had been imposed upon me, I was denounced by him in his second letter as a calumniator. Between these distracting influences, I put it to these philanthropists, Whether they would have me to remain still, and submit to worse than the martyrdom of life, the martyrdom of character, for the safety of their cause—and that when I knew there did exist, and were at that moment in the press, the materials of my ample vindication? I asked whether I should still submit to have the charge of being a gratuitous slanderer of Dr. Lee, which lurked in the resolutions of the second of December, again and again laid heavily against me—the means of my justification lying all the while unused within my reach? My friends in Glasgow, I had the satisfaction to find, agreed with me in thinking it was impossible for such a state of things to last, and that the temporary arrest which they had laid upon me should now terminate. It was my own opinion all the while, that no honest cause suffers in the long run, by the frankest and fullest disclosure, of all its circumstances. Such a cause ought to have no secret history.

A CONFERENCE, &c.

THE Opposition to the Old Moderators, who held their meeting on the second and issued their manifesto on the fifth of December, complain that the objections to Dr. Lee, as Moderator of the next General Assembly, were made in a way so private, as to prevent the possibility of a public refutation. It had been well if these reasons, when stated in private to several of the gentlemen who composed that meeting, had been of force enough with them and their coadjutors, to have prevented the necessity of any public discussion at all—a discussion that must be extremely painful to every one of the parties concerned. There can be little doubt that they must be aware of this painfulness; and when they challenge us to make a public charge, in order that they might have the opportunity of meeting it by a public vindication, they would perhaps be better pleased if the delicacies of the task which they call upon us to undertake should so far fetter and restrain us, as to spare them the necessity of saying one word more on the great zeal of Dr. Lee in the cause of Church Extension, or on the claim which he has acquired thereby to the suffrages of his brethren for the Moderatorship of the next General Assembly.

But now that the discussion has become inevitable, it is most assuredly they and not we who are responsible for all the discomforts that may attend upon it. The Old Moderators, in sending the usual notices of their recommendation through the Church, never I believe once mentioned the name of Dr. Lee. They are his own friends who first obtruded his name upon the public; and to this of course he himself must have given his consent. In the direct exercise of that duty which long usage had devolved upon us, we recommended Dr. Gardiner; and it is only now, in the act of repelling an unlooked-for interference, that we are called upon to resist Dr. Lee. When I gave the recommendation I gave my own reason along with it, in the shape of the following proposition—that "Dr. Gardiner was thoroughly to be trusted in those great public questions which are now pending between the Church and the Government." In now entering on the resistance that has been forced upon us by others, I shall also give my reason for it, and that in the shape of a simple counter proposition to the former—that "Dr. Lee is *not* thoroughly to be trusted in those great public questions which are now pending between the Church and the Government."

This, I repeat, is not a difficult, but truly a most disagreeable thesis; and I know not how much I would have given to have been exempted from the necessity of defending it. It is a necessity which I have done every thing to prevent, by statements in the form of precautionary warnings, to those whom I thought to be the friends of the Church, and at the same time knew to be the personal or party friends of Dr. Lee. But these precautions have all been disregarded, and that by

men who obviously feel the advantage of their own position, and as obviously presume on the delicacies of the predicament in which I now stand. They call for my objections to Dr. Lee;* and, if the call be not met, I know well the interpretation which is likely to be put upon it—that I have uttered in private things which I fear to avow in public—that I have whispered in the ear what I dare not proclaim upon the housetops.†

Such is the ungenerous use which some would make of the delicacies of this question. They know that there do exist reasons against the appointment of Dr. Lee as Moderator of the General Assembly, *in the present crisis of the Church;* but they also know that there is a strong and natural repugnance to the production of them. On this repugnance it is possible that they may be calculating, when they tell the public that there are no reasons which, if they but had the opportunity, they could not meet with an abundant refutation. In these circumstances, there seems no other alternative for us, than either the production of our reasons or the surrender of our cause. I have resolved, though with much pain, on the former term of this alternative; and it will be for others to decide, when once both the reasons and the refutation are laid before them, whether I, swayed by imaginative or malignant feelings, have endeavoured to practise on my brethren in the Church, by means of a bugbear of my own creation,—or they, my antagonists in this controversy, have wantonly hazarded the best interests of our Establishment; and in so far made a great public sacrifice, either to the partialities of friendship, or worse, to the objects of their own secular partizanship.

The readers will excuse me that I dwell so long on these painful and preliminary considerations—for all that I have told, does not form the tithe of all that I have felt, among the agitations and perplexities of this subject. This challenge of the Oppositionists for the production of reasons, places me in what may be called a trilemma. Either to surrender, and without a further struggle, into their hands, the business which they have been pleased to take up of settling the Moderatorship of the next Assembly; and that in the face of all the mischief to be apprehended, from this wayward movement of theirs, to the Church of Scotland. But this were an evil. Or to confine our explanations, as heretofore, to those occasions of converse and correspondence that come in our way; and so do injustice to a cause which admits, we think, of fullest and openest vindication. And this too were an evil. Or, finally, to accept of the challenge, and brave all the delicacies that must ensue, from the mixture of the personal with the public, in the treatment of a question so very peculiar as the one now before us—a question not originating with ourselves, but forced upon us from abroad. This last is also a bitter and a sore evil. Nevertheless we choose it as the least of the three.

And I feel not displeased, but the contrary, that, to fix and confirm this decision, an additional reason has sprung up for it in another

* "That the reasons for which Dr. Lee's nomination is avowedly opposed (though in a way which, from its private character, has hitherto prevented a public refutation) render it the more imperative on his friends not again to postpone it, as they would thereby be lending their sanction to imputations which they deem altogether unfounded."—Third Resolution of the Oppositionists.

† This is no longer an anticipation—I being now openly denounced as the calumniator of Dr. Lee.

quarter. The friends of Church Extension are now plying me with their enquiries, into the connection between the safety or prosperity of this great cause, and the question of the Moderatorship of the next General Assembly. It is not that it would involve me in the labours of a correspondence, far too multifarious for my other engagements. But I wish no longer to have it insinuated or said, that, through the unseen channels of social intercourse, I say aught on this subject which I might not say in the hearing of all the world. The time is now come when, after such a meeting and such a manifesto, I must break through the delicacies which would otherwise enthral me, and meet my antagonists on the arena of an open and fearless warfare.

But I must first take notice of a certain dexterity, by which they have attempted to prepossess the public in their favour. They have utterly misrepresented the position or the relation in which the two parties stand to each other in this question. They speak of us, the Old Moderators, as having opposed Dr. Lee. We have not opposed Dr. Lee. At the most we have only omitted him, as we did all the other ministers of the Church, when we proposed Dr. Gardiner. There seems a lurking imagination or assumption on the part of these gentlemen, that, somehow or other, the right of a primary and a positive administration in this matter is vested with themselves; and, by the force of this assumption, they would place us, the Old Moderators, who have exercised this right for half a century, in the status, and assign to us the character of an Opposition party. Notwithstanding our long possession of it, they clearly proceed on the conception that the initiative is theirs; and they seem to refer us, as the period of their investiture therewith, to a speech delivered at the last General Assembly. At this rate, any single speech-adventurer might constitute himself the autocrat of the Church of Scotland; and it is the appearance of this ludicrous pretension throughout their resolutions, that gives a certain grotesque character of absurdity and extravagance to this whole manifestation. At all events, it is clearly they and not we who are the Oppositionists.

The practice of the Old Moderators, not to nominate, but to recommend the new one, and to notify this recommendation to their friends throughout the Church, has subsisted for many years. Certain it is that the present Old Moderators did not create the practice. They only succeeded to it; and till this initiative be changed, it is not more their privilege than their duty to exercise it. Were it suspended any year, it might give rise to the greatest practical inconvenience. The General Assembly, on the first day of its meeting, might be distracted by an indefinite number of proposals from all parts of the country. And we mistake it, if we think that the Church would long remain without an initiative—for, should the right of the Old Moderators be extinguished, and no provision be made by the Supreme Court for any substitute in its room, the consequent disorder, like all other anarchy, would terminate in the resurrection of that very power, and probably in a more pernicious and revolting form, in some other quarter. When we thought to have abolished this initiative, we shall find that it had only been transferred—for, let it once be abandoned to the play of random elements, and it will speedily be seized upon by the most skilful intriguers or most successful agitators of the Church, who, reckless of all public considerations, would convert that chair into an instrument of subserviency, either to the policy of the reigning Government, or to the overweenings of their own favouritism.

Though myself the Moderator of the General Assembly in 1832, I took no spontaneous part in the business of the Old Moderators till the summer of 1835. I then received the intimation of a meeting to be held for the purpose of deliberating on a New Moderator for 1836. That meeting I could not attend; but, in my reply to the late Dr. Grant, stated, that I thought they could not do better than fix on Dr. Lee, who on more accounts than one, I thought, was entitled to the honour. I was not then aware that Dr. M'Leod was in view of the Old Moderators. But, at this distance of time, it is satisfactory to myself to reflect, that, when the question of the Moderatorship was presented to me in its most general form, and unmodified by any consideration of special times and special exigencies, I should, in my own mind, and when at liberty to range over the whole Church for Moderators, have lighted upon Dr. Lee as one of the fittest persons who occurred to me, for occupying the chair of the last General Assembly.

When the Moderatorship is viewed simply as an honour, which it mainly or rather exclusively is in peaceful and ordinary times, Dr. Lee possesses two distinct claims to it. In the first place, he is singularly versant in that kind of knowledge, which David Hume has specialized and dignified by the name of erudition—comprehending at least the facts of history, if not its philosophy; and often serviceable in the treatment of ecclesiastical questions, when a reference is made to the dates and the documents, or the deeds and decisions of other times. But in my estimation he possesses another and a higher claim to it, in those pastoral letters of the Assembly to the Church whereof he is the composer; and which deeply tinctured as they appear to me with the spirit and style of Moravianism, possess a simplicity and a beauty and an unction, that form the best literary characteristics of a devotional or apostolical address. It is our sincere hope, now that the Assembly has begun these paternal and yearly admonitions to the people of the land, that it will never intermit them; but persevere in an observance so well fitted to keep up a hallowed and endearing connection between the Church and the families of Scotland.

But while thus alive to the general pretensions of Dr. Lee, and fully participating both in the sentiment and the wish that he should be Moderator *some time*, I am not blind to the danger of his being Moderator this time; or so long as the question of Church Extension remains unsettled. The first circumstance which opened my eyes to this danger, was the singular part which Dr. Lee took at the meeting of the Assembly's Commission in September 1835—when it resolved on the all but unanimous expression of its dissatisfaction with the conduct of Government on this very question. He was the only clergyman that grafted a dissent on that resolution, and the only individual who dissented on a particular ground of his own.* What the particular ground was it is not necessary to mention. It is enough that on this occasion Dr. Lee made a most particular and unlooked for evolution, which fully warranted the apprehension that on future occasions, and in the further progress of this cause, he might make other evolutions equally particular and equally unlooked for. The man who could then strike out from all his brethren in the ministry, might afterwards strike out from the general sense of the Church on the subject of Church

* There was only another member of the Commission who dissented; and he was an elder.

Extension; and, if placed in an influential situation for it, might seriously endanger the cause. This consideration I admit is a very general one; and yet I am not afraid to confess that its effect on my own mind was a general feeling of insecurity, a strong dread and distrust of Dr. Lee—lest, if implicated in any way with the cause of Church Extension, that cause, whether in the treatment of it as a general question, or in the management of its details, would suffer in his hands. In this impression, however it might be redargued by special pleaders, I feel confident of being sympathised with by the plain and practical understanding of the Church; though they who are now driving on the measure of Dr. Lee's Moderatorship, affect to despise it—either determined at all hazards on the accomplishment of their object; or strangely insensible to a consideration, the force of which is felt and almost universally by other and ordinary men.

And it serves only to confirm our apprehension the more, when we look to the supporters of Dr. Lee, and take a special account of who they are. Doubtless among these, there are many who act exclusively on the consideration of his general claims to be Moderator some time, and who have not adverted to the special danger of his being Moderator this time. But, with the exception of them, the supporters of Dr. Lee are the declared and eager partisans of a Government that have been sorely embarrassed by this very question; and, who in their anxiety for its indefinite postponement, have more than once disappointed the Church of Scotland. I have been made to understand, that they are a few political lawyers of the Parliament House, who are the most zealous and busy and indefatigable supporters of his cause. The truth is that, whether intended by him or not, he achieved for their party a great service. He broke the clerical unanimity, that would else have stood forth, in one entire and unbroken array against them. He did as much as one man could do, to alleviate the discredit which they had incurred, by the resolution of the Commission of the General Assembly. They seem to have felt the value of his service; and it is but natural that they should now labour with all their might, in their respective spheres and vocations, to work out for him a grateful return.*

But to extenuate the hazards of this appointment, it is said, that the views or opinions of a Moderator are of no practical influence on the cause. There never was a greater delusion. They may have little or no influence in *ordinary* times. But, should ever the sentiments or the declarations of a Moderator unfortunately coalesce with the policy of a Government that has placed itself in a state of hostility to the

* The following extract from the Edinburgh Weekly Chronicle of March 19th, 1836, will show how soon this was taken up by the friends of Dr. Lee as a party and political question:—

"MODERATORSHIP OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

"It is understood that the Rev. Dr. Lee of this city was agreed upon by all parties in May last as the next Moderator, but that from the firm and judicious opposition he made to the agitating and most violent proceedings of his brethren in Aberdeen and Glasgow respecting the Royal Church Commissioners, which had the happy effect, if not of covering these Rev. Tories with disgrace, at least of counteracting all their machinations, he incurred their displeasure and that of the other more illiberal clergymen of the Church, who have in consequence started an opposition, in the person of the Rev. Dr. M'Leod of Campsie, now of Glasgow."

best interests of the Church, then, I cannot imagine a way in which the Church could do more by its own hands, to strengthen the policy of such a Government, than by the appointment of a Moderator who might sanction their indifference or their opposition to any of her objects, by the authority of his name. And it is quite in vain to pretend that a Government might not wish to avail themselves and need to avail themselves of some such authority. Surely if the insignificance of a Moderator be such as some would represent it, much greater must be the insignificance of a Procurator of the Church of Scotland. And yet when Mr. Bell, our present Procurator, made his appearance on the platform of a public meeting in Edinburgh, on the question of the Irish Church and in favour of the appropriation clause, we know the use that was made of it by the agents of Government—how it was paraded through all their newspapers—and the impression was industriously circulated, that there could be at least no great hostility on the part of the Church of Scotland to the anti-establishment measures of our present Administration.* If such use was made of a congenial Procurator, tenfold use could be made of a congenial Moderator, who, besides sustaining a representative character, would enjoy for a whole twelvemonth a representative access to the heads of the Government in London—and that a Government ready to seize on all the countenance for its measures, which it can possibly appropriate. In such hands and under such a management, the cause of Church Extension might be postponed or extinguished; or, even though in mockery of our anticipations and our fears, a grant was conceded to us, it might, by the influence of an unfriendly or unintelligent Moderator, be unaccompanied with such good provisions or accompanied with such bad ones, as to nullify the great object of the grant—a cheap and universal Christian education to the families of the common people.

It was under the force of these considerations, that, when several weeks after the meeting of the Assembly's Commission, I, in November, 1835, received another intimation of a meeting of the Old Moderators, I called on Dr. Grant, for the express purpose of withdrawing my recommendation of Dr. Lee. I stated to him the grounds of this withdrawment—the alarm and uneasiness I felt in consequence of his recent exhibition, and of the manifest good understanding which now seemed to subsist between him and the friends of a Government that had given such dissatisfaction to the Church of Scotland. With such a Government and such a Moderator, I did not feel that the cause of Church Extension was safe. In Dr. M'Leod, on the other hand, I recognised a zealous and consistent and uncompromising advocate for the cause both of common and Christian education. For the first time I took part in the circulation of the usual notices, and recommended Dr. M'Leod to my acquaintances in the Church, in the very terms that I now use with regard to Dr. Gardiner, as one who was thoroughly to

* This Irish Church Meeting was held on the 9th of April, 1835. It was called to address the King on "the appropriation of the surplus revenue of the Irish Church proposed by the recent vote of the House of Commons." The Procurator made no speech, but moved Bailie Macfarlane into the Chair. One of the resolutions contained the words, "That this meeting are deeply impressed with the justice and wisdom of the Resolution lately passed by the House of Commons, for appropriating the surplus revenue of the Irish Church to the education of the people of Ireland."

be trusted in the questions that were then and are still pending, between the Church and the Government.

The principles then which have guided me in the question of the Moderatorship for 1837, are identically the principles which I had already brought to bear on the question of the Moderatorship for 1836. In recommending Dr. Gardiner, I am but holding on in the path on which I entered more than a twelvemonth ago, so long previous to the delivery of that speech in the last General Assembly—before which we are told that all the established usages of the Church, and all considerations for its welfare must in the present instance give way. Another cycle of the heavens has rolled over us, and no change has yet taken place, that can warrant a deviation in the present year, from the procedure of the year which went before it—that which was best and the Church's truest policy then, being its best and truest policy still. If there be a change of circumstances at all, it is such as more imperiously calls for a perseverance in the course that has been taken—the crisis of the Church being still more imminent than before, and the grounds of distrust in Dr. Lee being both stronger and greatly more specific than before. It is on the statement of these additional grounds, that I rest my own further vindication; and at the same time acquit myself of the duty which I conceive lies upon me of addressing a public warning to the Church, now that all private and preventive warnings have been so unfortunately disregarded.

But let me just advert to the slender basis on which the charge of calumny has been constructed against me. I have, for two successive years, recommended two distinct men as Moderators of the General Assembly—because of their each possessing the very greatest requisite, in these times, for the duties of that high office. And this is an implied slander against him, of whom I had made no mention, and therefore did not say that he also was possessed of this high requisite. The expressed compliment, of those who were deserving of it, is an implied charge against him of whom I did not say that he was deserving of it also. It is remarkable, that this serious and offensive imputation, as it has been called, was not charged upon me sooner. I never heard of it, as connected with my notices throughout the Church, respecting Dr. M'Leod; nor, till within these few weeks, of my similar notices of Dr. Gardiner. But, stronger than this, instead of remote implication, I have openly and expressly stated my sense of the disqualifications of Dr. Lee, and in the first place to whom?—to his own friends, and some of them the most zealous of his present supporters, and resolutionists too, of the 2d December. They never once resented my statement, as if it contained the least moral reflection upon Dr. Lee—for, in truth, neither to them nor to any one else, have I said any thing of his moral disqualifications for the office. It is true, I have discussed the matter freely, when called upon to do so. For Dr. Lee is no longer a private individual, when his name is associated with a great public office; and his fitness for that office has become a topic for fair and right discussion, to every lover of his Church and of his country. It is a topic which I never refused to entertain in conversation, and on which I have been called to deliver myself in my replies to letters that were sent to me on the subject. But never, all the while, was I conscious myself, nor was it hinted to me by others, that I was aspersing the moral character of Dr. Lee. This is a recent invention,

first set forth by the Resolutionists of the 2d December, for the purpose of enlisting the generous sympathies of the Church in favour of their calumniated and much injured candidate; and now reiterated by them in loud and open proclamation, when the outcries of a generous indignancy are lifted up, as if to form a sort of graceful exit for the enterprise which they have taken in hand.

And before I address my brethren at large, I first invite their presence and attention to a colloquy or reckoning, which I mean to hold with certain individuals, on whom I want to fasten the obligation of a more special attention to the distinct parts of my argument. I have already spoken *of* Mr. Robert Bell, the Procurator of our Church. I now speak *to* him, recognising, as I do, in his person both one of his Majesty's Commissioners on the means of religious instruction in Scotland, and a Canvasser for Dr. Lee.

I beg then, Mr. Bell, in the first place to remind you, of my own evidence delivered in your hearing, before the Commission, on the 20th of last February. Among other things I stated, that there were 325 families in the locality of the Water of Leith; and that at the last half-yearly term of flitting, only eight new families had come within the district. I followed up this statement by the remark, that the fluctuation of the people from one town parish to another was, I thought, much over-rated; and, more particularly, that, however great the fluctuation might be, it was kept up very much by the same people, who, constantly on the wing, alternated over the heads of a stable population —the families who leave us this year, being, to a great extent, the very families who had come to us the year before. The obvious inference from this is, that were a parish minister to reside amongst them, he would not be so exposed to large and incessant changes of Parishioners, by the removal of old, and the succession of new families as many apprehended; but that, with the advantage of the settled intimacies of long and familiar acquaintanceship, he would obtain a rooted moral ascendancy in the midst of them—the wholesome influence of which on the general habits and character of the place were above all calculation.

You will further recollect that, a few evenings thereafter, you did me the honour of a call, when you informed me that Dr. Lee, who, it seems, was present at the delivery of this evidence, had come up to you, and stated that I was altogether wrong; and that the fluctuations of the families were both so rapid and extensive, that little or no good could be done by a minister in the way that I specified. This intelligence more than annoyed; it grieved, and was exceedingly painful to me: and I expressed myself in a tone and feeling of earnestness, with which I am sure you could not sympathize—bidding you beware of Dr. Lee's authority on this subject, who, however versant in the lore of Church antiquities and Church Law, was not to be trusted, either for his observation or for his judgment, in those practical matters which entered into any question of Church economics. The truth is, that I had heard, a hundred times over, the same exaggerated estimate of town fluctuations; and it does no harm to those who have thoroughly studied all the influences and bearings of our Church Extension Scheme—it being with them not an argument against, but an argu-

mentum a fortiori in its favour.* The effect, however, is very different on those, who have but slightly attended to the matter; which, give me leave to say, I feared to be the case both with Dr. Lee and with yourself; and, apprehensive of his then growing influence over you, I did feel a lively alarm, lest this common understanding between you should be turned to the prejudice of the parochial system—the only one, I believe, by which the population of our cities can be reclaimed to the habits of their forefathers. It is a most revolting view that is taken of the plebeian families, either of Edinburgh or of any other town, when they are thus looked upon as we should on a gipsy race of unreclaimed and irreclaimable wanderers—the outcasts of a sunken and now hopeless degeneracy, every effort for recalling whom to the Christian observances of other days is to be heartlessly laughed at, as if it were a schoolboy imagination, a mere vision of Utopia. Beside that one's fondest wishes are painfully thwarted by it, there is a mental agony which few can understand, when the growing and now matured convictions of many long years are thus doomed to a perpetual encounter, with the endless crudites and perversities of men, who have bestowed little thought and have no experience on the subject. Even a grant would not console me, if unaccompanied by the provisions and guards of the parochial system.† It would advance the incomes of the clergy, but it would not advance the Christian education of the common people; and if, under the guidance of such men as yourself and Dr. Lee, the parochial system of Scotland is not to be the basis of the Endowment we seek for, I should feel that the best objects of such an endowment were altogether frustrated; and that all the labours and anxieties of the best part of my life had been utterly thrown away.

You did not inform me that Dr. Lee was to be called upon for his counter-evidence on this subject. I know not whether it was you that asked, or he that offered to overset the testimony I had given; but I learned afterwards that his examination was to take place; and that, meanwhile, he was making diligent preparations for it. To accomplish himself for the task, he explored the police books of the city, and himself made a survey in person among the houses in or bordering on the Cowgate. He made no secret of his object, which was to prove that the parochial system in towns was a phantom or a chimera. I could not help remarking the analogy between his movements and that of the dissenters, with Bailie Maclaren at their head, who by a rapid run over the whole of Edinburgh in the course of a fortnight, endeavoured, but in vain, to overset the impregnable statistics of our Extension Committee, which comprehended only a population of twenty thousand, and cost us the labours of several months, ere we could bring it to its accomplishment. Whether the animus which impelled

* Because the establishment of a parochial economy in any district has the effect of binding its inhabitants the more to their places of occupation, and it would greatly lessen the number of changes; and because even though the fluctuation were not diminished, if there were a universal parochial economy, the migration would only take place from one well ordered parish to another, where the moralizing influences of the system would still be brought to bear on the new settlers.

† There are, first, the annexation of a small enough territorial district to each new church: second, a low enough seat-rent for the circumstances of the people: third, a preference for the vacant sittings at each term of seat-letting to the inhabitants of the newly assigned parish.

his movement was the same with that which actuated theirs, I will not pretend to say. But of this I am sure, that, as being the movement of an established clergyman, it, in point of fact, was far more mischievous; and Sir, if the witness whom you delight to honour shall be advanced by your means to the Moderator's Chair, you will have earned this as the fruit of your assiduities—that, from the mouth of the Church's highest functionary, you have obtained a testimony of deadlier import, than that of all her enemies, against the principles of a territorial establishment, and so on the side of voluntaryism.

It is on that evidence, Sir, that I mean to take my stand, in all that remains of the argument which I hold with you. It was an evidence the delivery of which at the time pained and confounded every honest churchman; while it charmed the hearts of all the voluntaries who heard it.

I pass over his monstrous exaggerations on the amount of parish removals. His evidence would make us believe, that the majority of the families in a plebeian parish left it every year; and that, not in many months more, a minister would be bereft of all his original parishioners. Though we knew him to be glaringly wrong, yet, apprehensive of his dangerous influence, and above all of the welcome wherewith such evidence would be received and acted on at the head quarters of the government you serve, I deemed it of sufficient importance to employ two of my best statists—one in his old, and the other in his present parish. The general result of their surveys I give in the Appendix. They soon ascertained that Dr. Lee's adverse evidence was far wider of the truth, than that of the most reckless of those voluntaries who went forth on the same errand with himself, and laboured hard, but not harder than he did, to impugn the accuracy both of our statistics and of our views. The worst or poorest part of one of his parishes was the first entered on, and I had the satisfaction of learning in a single day, that, of fifty contiguous families, and of the humblest condition, only five had been less than six months in the parish, while more than one half of them was composed of families, 32 in number, who had been severally in the same parish for upwards of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 30, years. Dr. Lee's testimony was to the effect that many of the families changed not only every month but every week, and that they were nearly all weekly tenants.

But it seems that the examination of Dr. Lee was not confined to the single topic of the migratory habits of the people. He took a large and excursive view of the whole question; and, from the instances which I proceed to give, the reader will judge in how far his evidence delivered in your own hearing, and now under your eye, entitled you to tell the Church, as you have done in your resolutions of the 2d of December, that you "knew Dr. Lee to be most cordially interested in the promotion of the great scheme of Church Extension in which the Church is at present engaged."

But let me here advert to a peculiarity which characterizes Dr. Lee's manner as a witness, beyond that of all other men. He abounds in the use of those words which might be termed the indefinites or the indeterminates of language; or when he does employ a determinate word, it might still have the effect of making his testimony vague and ambiguous, by means of the negative particle which he is in the habit

of prefixing to it, as *not strictly, not exactly, not altogether*. Now when the reply is so framed, the examinator is at liberty to take as much of it as will serve his own use; while the examinee might reserve as much as will serve his own vindication. It is like a hollow tube open at both ends, by which, in the first instance, the party examining can draw out to himself enough to justify his wrong purpose; and the party examined can, by the other loophole, draw back to himself enough to cover him from the imputation of having advanced a wrong principle. Of this peculiarity all the printed evidence of Dr. Lee's, which I have seen, supplies innumerable illustrations. It is thus, while it is impossible to mistake the general effect of his evidence before the Commission on the means of religious instruction, as being strongly and decidedly adverse to the scheme of Church Extension—a man of legal ingenuity, we doubt not, could make a good defence for many of those separate answers, which, nevertheless, go to augment the impression of his hostility to our scheme with all readers of plain and ordinary understanding.

And it must further be observed that, while responsible for the substantial correctness of all the instances that we are now to adduce, we are precluded from giving the ipsissima verba of any part of Dr. Lee's evidence. The truth is, that we applied to one of the Commissioners residing in the country for the use of his copy; and, after an interval of nine days, were informed by him that it was contrary to the regulations that had been adopted by the Board. Before receiving this answer, I applied to the Secretary for access to the printed evidence, as I particularly wished to consult it, but no notice was taken by him of my communication. I therefore do not give the express words of Dr. Lee's depositions; but I am quite sure as to the import of them, and, more particularly, that I do not overstate their injurious effect on that great scheme of Church Extension in which the Church is at present engaged.

1. Dr. Lee told you, in substance, that the idea of making congregations wholly parochial in a parish like Edinburgh was chimerical, and in some respects not desirable. Now, there lurks in this testimony a principle, in direct and diametrical opposition to the scheme of Extension in which the Church is at present engaged. We may never succeed in making the congregations *strictly* parochial; but it is our aim to make the nearest possible approximation to it, and, by every such approximation, we consider ourselves as making a step in advance towards that optimism which we are ever struggling to reach, though we may never fully realize it. The state of being strictly parochial, we regard as the *summum bonum* of our undertaking; and, while Dr. Lee affirms that in some respects it is not desirable, our whole system is founded on the principle, that, in one and all respects, it is most desirable. The parochial system, both in town and country, is the *sine qua non* on which we proceed, in all the grants that are made from the Church Extension fund. So far from regarding the idea of it as impracticable, it is the very idea which, as forming the specific and essential characteristic of our scheme, we labour with all our might to realize. The articles or conditions on which we give our aid are so framed, as to afford the greatest possible security for congregations being parochial; and could other articles be devised that would strengthen that security, and make it more perfect than before, we

should instantly adopt it as an improvement on our scheme. And these articles form part and parcel of every constitution which the General Assembly grants to the new churches that receive our aid. The system which Dr. Lee is pleased to denounce as chimerical, is that to which the united wisdom of the Church has given her high sanction; and already is it nobly accredited by the result in many of our parishes. The glorious experiences of the John Knox Church in Aberdeen, of St. John's in Dundee, of the Dean and St. Leonard's churches in Edinburgh, of St. Mark's and half a dozen more in Glasgow, and of others in Paisley which I cannot at present name—all tell the efficiency of the parochial system, even in the poorest districts of the largest towns in Scotland; and all unite in casting their emphatic rebuke on the head of that precipitate adventurer, who has rushed unbidden into a field, on which, to him a *terra incognita*, a land of bewilderment and darkness, he ought never to have entered.

Certain it is, that every argument, which our Church Extension Committee ever addressed to our rulers in behalf of an endowment, rests on the efficiency of the parochial system—as the only system, in fact, which can be brought to bear, with full adaptation and influence, on the humbler classes of Society. But when Dr. Lee tells these rulers, that in *some* respects this is not desirable, he tells them that *in so far* it is unworthy of being paid for by the State. But after having learned from him that in so far it is unworthy of being paid for, they will determine the question of *in how far* for themselves. They will make their own use of his testimony; and, as being the testimony of one of our own ecclesiastics, it will go a far way to justify their refusal of our claims.

And yet, Sir, you have given assurance to all ministers and elders, and on your own knowledge too, that "Dr. Lee is most cordially interested in the promotion of the great scheme of Church Extension in which the Church is at present engaged."

2. But further, you ask Dr. Lee in substance, if the parochial work would be better done by ministers than missionaries? And his reply in substance is, Yes, but that it is not possible to carry it in this way to a great extent. Then, Sir, is the Assembly's Extension Committee engaged in an impracticable scheme. If our hopes of success, and our practical arrangements, hinge on one principle more than on another, it is on the efficacy of household and week-day ministrations, in reclaiming our outcast population to the decencies and habits of other days. Here lies the very essence of our scheme; and yet, with a hardihood which will amaze every reader, do you and your coadjutors make the confident assertion, not of your believing or your hoping, but of your knowing, that "Dr Lee is most cordially interested in the promotion of the great scheme of Church Extension, in which the Church is at present engaged."

3. But again, you in substance ask, would not the minister be in better circumstances for doing good to his parishioners, if he could ask them to come to his own church? And the following is, in substance, Dr. Lee's reply—It is natural to suppose so, but a minister must feel great delicacy in asking people to attend his own church—And in connexion with this he further, in substance, tells you, that at present there is a great prejudice against the attempt to make proselytes. Now, Sir, what have we here? We have heard of the delicacy of the

Government which employs you towards the Catholics of Ireland; and how every attempt to make an inroad on the Popery of that unhappy land, is branded with proselytism as with a hateful name. It is the first time, Sir, that I have met with the application of this sentiment to the work of a Christian minister at home—the first time in my life, that I have heard of any delicacy to restrain him from making inroad on the wretched profligacy and the wretched ignorance of his own parishioners. Heaven forefend, Sir, that the infidel policy of our times should ever obtain the remotest semblance of encouragement from the Church of Scotland; or, worst of all, that those statesmen who defend it, should ever appeal for its vindication, either to the direct avowals or to the mincing ambiguities of one of our own Moderators.

4. You go on, in substance, to ask—Do not ministers receive for answer from the parishioners that they have no sittings?—to which question Dr. Lee, in substance, replies—That is not in fact the true cause. A great many of them could have free sittings if they chose.—Now, Sir, this, so far from friendship to the extension scheme, is just telling us that it is a scheme which ought never to have been adopted. It is a reflection, not on any of its steps or on any of its proceedings, but on the very being of it. Every enlightened extensionist will recognize in this answer a faithful echo to the complaint and the cry of all the voluntaries—the hundred times made and the as often times refuted objection, against which we have had to struggle from the very infancy of our existence. The objection is altogether a vital one; for, if sustained, what were the use of our new churches? If the objection had been given way to at the first, we should never have commenced operations; or, had we not been able clearly and triumphantly to dispose of it, we should never have continued them. That the objection should remain with unquelled force in the mind of Dr. Lee, is a proof, not of hostility alone, but of singular unintelligence as to the real merits of our cause. And yet, Sir, in the face of such an answer, do you come forward in the face of the whole Church of Scotland, and tell its ministers and elders all to vote for Dr. Lee, because you know him to be "most cordially interested in the promotion of the great scheme of Church Extension in which the Church is at present engaged."

5. Then follows, Sir, in substance, a very remarkable declaration from Dr. Lee—In my opinion, the likeliest way of bringing out the people to attend church, would be to institute a better system of education.—The reader will not fail to observe the precise coincidence between this declaration, and the reigning policy of the times. A Government that should found their measure on this assertion of Dr. Lee's, taken in conjunction with his immediately foregoing answer, would be perfectly justified, nay, is positively called upon, to refuse a grant for the endowment of additional clergymen. Their reply would, and their reply ought to be—We refuse churches, but we shall give you schools. What the character of these schools should be, or whether they should be placed in any relation to the church, are different questions; and the determination of which the Government would probably take upon themselves. We should certainly feel more hopefully of schools instituted as appendages to our new churches, and for the purpose of supplementing them, than of schools instituted for

the purpose of superseding them. And the reader will perhaps begin now to participate more than he has done hitherto in our feelings and our fears, and to admit at least the possibility of mischief being hatched between a Government and a Moderator. Gentlemen, they would be fully entitled to say—this is the man of your choice, and these are his sentiments. We have given him our highest confidence; but not till you had set us the example, by giving him your highest confidence also. We have exalted his testimony above that of all his fellows; but not till you had exalted himself above all his fellows, by investing him with the greatest honour which your Church can bestow.

Nothing, Sir, can better prepare the way for such a result, than the confidence of an unsuspecting Church in the solemn declaration of you and your fellow-resolutionists, when you tell its ministers and elders that you all "know Dr. Lee to be most cordially interested in the promotion of the great scheme of Church Extension, in which the Church is at present engaged."

6. The next interrogation which, in substance, I shall notice is—If a minister had less extra-parochial work to do, would he not accomplish more within the parish? Dr. Lee admits the obviousness of this effect, but he does not think it desirable that it should be so. Both the readers and myself have now ceased to marvel at this, or any other answer from Dr. Lee. We only now marvel at you, in the position you hold as middle man between two parties; and we do marvel, that, after taking in these answers from Dr. Lee, you should turn to the Church, and let out to its ministers and elders the following averment, that "you know Dr. Lee to be most cordially interested in the promotion of the great scheme of Church Extension, in which the Church is at present engaged."

7. Another of your questions, in substance, is—Would you rely altogether on an improved system of education? and his answer, in substance, is—That he scarcely would, but is rather of opinion, that if a good method of education had been instituted, the people would not have lapsed into their present and prevalent state of ignorance.—It is not to dispute the truism which Dr. Lee rather thinks, while I and all other men fully and absolutely believe in it, that I single out this question with its answer. I give it as a specimen of Dr. Lee's indefinites, his *rather*, and his *scarcely*, and his *not entirely*. The legislature is at perfect liberty to make just as little use of this *scarcely* as they please. They may contract it into an infinitesimal; and so adopt an improved system of education, as their alone specific for the moral regeneration of our land.

8. The last question I shall advert to, in substance, is—Have you any other observations to offer? Dr. Lee, in substance, answers, as his only observation—That the progress of the people's degeneracy is very much owing to a wrong state of the law in regard to the use of spirituous liquors. There is truth in this reply; and we would only remark, but without laying much or indeed any stress upon it, that, when taken in connexion with the former replies, by which he had effectually battered down our scheme of Church Extension—it has very much the aspect of being Dr. Lee's specific for the moral amelioration of the people, and by which he would supersede our nostrum for the same object. After having set aside the Extension scheme, it was doubtless encumbent upon him, unless he regarded the improve-

ment of the population as a thing either altogether hopeless or insignificant, to substitute something in its place; and for this object better clearly, in his estimation, than a grant for the endowment of new Churches, would be a tax upon whisky.

Now, Sir, what is the general effect of these various depositions on the part of Dr. Lee? And what is the practical measure that Government is entitled to found upon them? To refuse the endowment for Churches, and offer an endowment for schools in place of them. And what were the further effect of that measure on which you have set your heart, and for the accomplishment of which you now labour so strenuously—even the Moderatorship of Dr. Lee? It would give your employers in London the very advantage over us, in their treatment of the cause of Church Extension, which they are now said to have in their practisings on the Church of Ireland. They have there, we are told, I will not say how truly, got a like-minded Archbishop to give a colour and a countenance to all their misdoings. We have no Archbishop to give them; but they will get the best we have, if we give them a like-minded Moderator. The only difference between the two cases is, that, by their own patronage and their own act, they may provide a right Archbishop for themselves. They will have you to thank for it, if, in this the most trying crisis of our Church's history, they, on the question of Church Extension, shall be provided with a right Moderator.

9. I shall conclude these instances taken from the evidence of Dr. Lee, with one observation more of his, and I leave it with my brethren in the Church to determine the character which it stamps on this whole enterprise. He told you, Sir, after he had made his statements —That he had no favourite theory to support,* that he did not agree with his brethren; but that he did not like to come into collision with them, although their views were different from his own.—These may not be the words, but they contain the very substance of his declaration, and the effect of which is not to be impaired, Sir, by all the expletives and the qualifying clauses wherewith it is accompanied. The differences with his brethren, of which he would not tell us, he goes to your Board, and pours into the ear of the Government Commissioners—no bad intimation of the danger that the Church would incur, by a Moderator, who, having no common understanding with his brethren at large, would pour his unknown and before uncommunicated things into the ears of the Government itself. But, Sir, my reckoning is not with the evidence of Dr. Lee; my reckoning is with the manifesto of the Resolutionists. Dr. Lee's evidence tells one thing; their manifesto tells another and an opposite thing. That Church, whose servant you are, is hereby misinformed; and misinformed, too, in a way that is directly fitted to mislead them. The evidence of Dr. Lee is a hostile evidence to the cause of Church Extension. But meanwhile the manifesto of the Resolutionists, which asserts his friendship to the cause, blindfolds the ministers and elders—and that too at a time, when the printed evidence is secreted from the eyes of the Church, and treasured up for the use of the Government.

I dislike excessively the whole getting up of that evidence, and still

* Meaning, I believe, the theory of the Parochial System, which he had before denounced as chimerical—and, of course, the theory of Church Extension as being identified therewith.

more the following of it up afterwards. You had previously obtained a mass of overwhelming testimonies in favour of the Church; but Dr. Lee's evidence, I mean not his parochial but his general evidence on the question at large, was reserved to the last and was then delivered with all the pomp and circumstance of a closing testimony. After a questionary process, I understand, of two days, a long written exposition was read and given in by himself, and I presume is to be found in the printed evidence taken before the Commission in Edinburgh. That in its separate particulars, and still more in its general effect, it was most injurious to the cause of Church Extension, we have the concurrent testimony of all who heard it. Now, Sir, after having gotten such hostile evidence from Dr. Lee, what were the effect of his elevation to the Moderator's Chair for which you are contending so earnestly? I speak not of its effect in Edinburgh, where Dr. Lee's singularities are known; but of its effect in London, where he would be only known by his general reputation, and by his high office as Moderator of the Church of Scotland. Even as it now stands, his adverse testimony is abundantly deleterious, in neutralizing the effect of other and sounder testimonies; but after being raised to the eminence you are now working so hard to obtain for him, who does not see, that, invested with tenfold malignity and force, the evidence of Dr. Lee will shed a deadlier and more wide-wasting blight on all the good Church evidence that went before it?

It is impossible to anticipate what the Government is to do, and therefore I only speak of them hypothetically. Amid the reelings of the Cabinet and the reelings of the country, I will not myself venture on any computation. But it is good to be prepared beforehand; and should the necessities of their condition again compel your employers to another postponement of our claims, you, in the mean time, are diligently constructing for them the best possible apology, by doing all you can, to invest with the authority of office and clothe with the insignia of a high and honourable distinction, the evidence of Dr. Lee.

Dr. Lee presides, and with great ability, over a high department in the public service of the Church; and the good to be done by those yearly addresses of which he has been hitherto the writer, is beyond all computation. Should I or any man make hostile inroad on this domain, pour ridicule on these saintly and beautiful compositions, or try to undermine their effect on the parishes of Scotland, we should justly forfeit all claim to the confidence of the Church, and most certainly all claims to its Moderatorship. But Dr. Lee has made spontaneous invasion on another and very high department of the Church's service; and obtruded such views and opinions on the Commissioners of a reluctant, if not a hostile Government, as are fitted, not to advance the cause of Church Extension, but utterly to destroy it. Am I whom the General Assembly has invested with the charge of this department, to sit an unconcerned spectator; and make no endeavour to open the eyes of the Church to the danger which I conceive hangs over the interest they have confided into my hands? Let us first have a right Church Extension, and a right University Measure, and my resistance to Dr. Lee ceases—a resistance that would never have been made, had not Dr. Lee broken loose on another territory than his own, and endeavoured to lay low the chief strengths and securities by which it is guarded. The moment that all possibility of mischief is taken from

the office of Moderator, Dr. Lee is most abundantly welcome (from me at least) to all the honours of it.

Before taking leave of Mr. Bell, I have one question more to address to him. Did you tell all your coadjutors in this Opposition, to us the Old Moderators—did you tell them the nature and tendency of Dr. Lee's evidence? Did you tell Dr. Gordon of it, or Dr. Dickson, or Mr. Candlish; or did you speak of it to Mr. Whigham and Mr. Walter Cook? We have heard oftener than once of the delicacy which your situation as Commissioner imposes on you. Was it this delicacy which restrained you from informing these men? Then why did not the same delicacy restrain you from misleading these men?—or why did not the delicacy forbid you from meddling with this business at all? Sir, if these men went along with you under the impulse of Dr. Lee's general claims to be Moderator some time, and you did not tell them that which was known to yourself and which would have opened their eyes to the special danger of his being Moderator this time—then, though you have not misled them aggressively, they have been misled by the ignorance in which they were left by you.

I shall take no further notice of Mr. Cook or Mr. Whigham, than simply to crave forgiveness for the liberty I have used with their names; but I will not make the same apology to the other three whom I have mentioned, though all of them revered by myself, and ranking honourably and high among the ecclesiastics of our land. Kind and amiable but withal simple-hearted clergymen, you have abundantly manifested the innocence of the dove; but as you have forgotten to take a lesson from the serpent, you must just submit to the humiliation of being told that you have indeed been misled most egregiously—and let me warn you to greater circumspection in future, lest some worse delusion be practised on your gentle natures, by men who, if not wiser, are wilier than yourselves.

These, Sir, I will not rank among your proper and primary coadjutors, even though it is possible that they may have originated the Movement, unless they knew all that you know which is adverse to the Moderatorship of Dr. Lee; and yet, in the face of this knowledge, went cordially along with you. And, on the same principle, I feel assured, that I could effect a still further reduction in the number of those who remain to you. I cannot believe that all, or even one half of them, knew the import or character of his evidence before your Commission; and yet joined with you in telling the Church that they knew Dr. Lee to be a cordial promoter of the Assembly's Scheme of Church Extension. But I shall attempt no further decimation. We can afford to do without it. After having removed the three ecclesiastics, who, with great policy and address, have been allowed to take the fore-front of your enterprise—after having drawn aside the screen which is blazoned and set forth with their venerated names, let the Church and the public obtain a sight of those behind it, who are still standing upon your side. My worthy and respected friend the minister of St. Cuthbert's has authenticated the list which I now give of them. Beside yourself Mr. Robert Bell Procurator, there are Mr. Alexander Earle Monteith Advocate, and Mr. John Cowan Advocate, and Mr. Alexander Dunlop Advocate, and lastly Mr. John Shank More Advocate. The Church will determine whether these, with even the professorial chairman at their head, constitute a fitting body to usurp that

privilege which for half a century has been committed into other hands —whether this upstart power shall trample, and without even the ceremony of a formal abrogation, on the prescriptive and possessory right, the use and wont, the long-established initiative of the Old Moderators.

In conclusion, Sir, let me inform you, that, debarred as I have been by you, from all access to the printed evidence of Dr. Lee, I am aware that I labour in consequence under a certain disadvantage. I am not disputing at present the propriety of your regulation, to withhold the sight of that evidence from all but yourselves. Neither will I comment on the power which this self-imposed secrecy gives you to mislead the Church, and at the same time to protect yourself from exposure. But I wish you to understand, that I hold myself responsible, for the substantial accuracy of all that I have stated, in regard both to special parts of that evidence, and to the general character of the whole, as standing in direct and diametrical opposition to that scheme, of which you have told the world that Dr. Lee is a cordial promoter. And I am willing, Sir, to be tested by that evidence, to which I make my appeal, whenever you and the other Commissioners shall think fit to make it public. Meanwhile I know, Sir, that, with the eye of a lynx, do you and your brother lawyers watch for my halting; and already have sounds of fearful import been employed, to shake me from my purposes. The threats of ecclesiastical prosecution are now suspended over me; and of other scaring consequences, I have received no obscure intimation. Sir, these things will not move me. I have counted the cost, and I find my cause to be worthy of martyrdom. If supported by my God and by my conscience—not all the power and hostility of the Government under which you serve, not all the ingenious and protracted torture of that legal machinery within the reach and ready use of the profession to which you belong, shall ever cause me to swerve by one hairbreadth from the duty I owe to my Church, and to the noble cause which they have put into my hands.

My second conference is with the ministers of Edinburgh; and I cannot adequately describe to you the sensation of relief which I experience, in making my escape from the moral discomforts of the region which I have just traversed, and sitting down in the midst of you.

But I must first premise, that any additional evidence to be given in your hearing against the Moderatorship of Dr. Lee, I cannot plead for the purpose of my own vindication, in having determined to act on the expediency of his exclusion from the chair of 1837. The truth is, that that determination was come to, long before any of the further evidence which I am still to insist upon had transpired. Dr. M'Gill knows that I had announced both my determination and my reasons for it to him, so early as the beginning of June—whereas the whole of my remaining argument is founded on evidence posterior to this; and chiefly on the examination of Dr. Lee before a Committee of the House of Commons, of which I did not know till several weeks after the publication of their Report, ordered to be printed on the 4th of July.

But I have still another explanation to offer. The personal friends of Dr. Lee may feel, and his party friends do affect, a high and generous indignancy, at my having uttered aught so unseemly, as an ex-

pression of distrust in Dr. Lee's fitness to be Moderator, during our present exigencies, of the General Assembly of the Church. This they have chosen to construe into an impeachment of his moral integrity; and on this plea are they dexterously trying to enlist the justice and the sympathies of the Church upon his side. Gentlemen, I say nothing of his moral disqualifications. And it is with the greatest pain to myself, that I have been called out by his friends of the 2d of December to speak of those mental defects and perversities, on which my objections to the Moderatorship of Dr. Lee are principally founded. But even though, in addition to these, I should advert to his political leanings, I would be doing no more than has been done by the keenest advocates of Dr. Lee, both towards myself and towards the cause of Church Extension a hundred times over— when denounced and vilified, the one as a Tory and the other as a mere artifice of Toryism. I would not trust Dr. Lee with that which is at present the Church's greatest cause, just as I would not trust any private cause to an advocate, of whom I knew that his understanding was against me—or that his statements were vague and unimpressive—or that, from the want of distinct and definite conceptions, he dealt in mincing and ambiguous phraseology—or that he was prone to sudden impulses, which carried him to-morrow a thousand miles off from the better and sounder argument of the day that had preceded it. On these grounds he would forfeit all my confidence, at least so as to keep me from putting any business into his hands; and yet, with all these foibles of the intellect, it is possible he might be a man of noble feelings and the purest integrity notwithstanding.

Gentlemen, there are some of yourselves whom I would not trust with the management of your own cause—I mean the cause of the Annuity, or of the ecclesiastical fund that exists in Edinburgh for the maintenance of its clergymen. I think I could name a few of you, who, on this subject, are perfect children in understanding; and yet have a conscientiousness, and a Christian worth, and a devotedness to the great objects of your sacred profession, which are above all Greek and all Roman fame. These would be the last men I should think of sending to London, there to propound their views before a Committee of either House of Parliament; and yet, it may be thought odd, these very men, whom I now have in my eye, I could trust with the Moderatorship of the General Assembly. Why then not trust Dr. Lee? and I put the question in this connection, for the very purpose of setting forth another peculiarity of his, that makes me afraid of him— while not afraid of others as unintelligent, perhaps even as wrong as him, on the question of Church Extension. They would not meddle with the question. He would. One of his great errors is that he does not know his own limits, and so aspires to be an authority in every thing. He has a forte; and if he would only keep by it, and interfere with others as little as others are disposed to interfere with him, it were better for the peace of the Church, and greatly better for his own reputation.

Let us hear no more, then, of our insinuations against the moral character of Dr. Lee.* Only let me further observe, that some of your

* I never could have believed that Dr. Dickson, with all his known facility, could have been prevailed upon, I doubt not by others behind the curtain, to have penned

number are greatly misled by an overweening, I would say somewhat idolatrous, estimation of his intellectual qualifications. I believe him to be greatly beyond us all, indeed out of our sight altogether, in the knowledge of recondite antiquity—a high and respectable acquisition; but, because shrined in the hieroglyphical mystery of black letter and the unknown characters of other days, you, on the principle I imagine that ignorance is the mother of devotion, have been in the habit of regarding it with somewhat of an extravagant and superstitious veneration. Now let me bid you advert to the distinction which obtains between three faculties, that may exist in different minds, independently and apart from each other. There is the faculty of research, to tell us how things were. There is the faculty of observation, to tell us how things are. There is the faculty of judgment, to tell us how things ought to be. Dr. Lee possesses the first—he is deficient in the two last of these faculties.

In virtue of the first, he made a most valuable contribution to your cause, by his pamphlet on the Annuity Tax—containing an admirable historical demonstration of the origin and entire transmission of that right, from its commencement to the present times. In defect of the second, he tells a most extravagant story to the Commissioners, about the movements and the migrations of the common people of Edinburgh. In defect of the third, he decries the best arrangements of that Church Extension Scheme, which has been so strangely represented as the object of his cordial approbation. It is unfortunate for his claims to the Moderatorship, that, at present, the two last faculties are of immeasurably greater importance than the first, to qualify a man for discharging the part of a representative, from the Church to the Government in London. Dr. Lee would neither inform our rulers aright of the destitution of Scotland; nor would he advise them aright of the remedy that should be provided for it.

The reputation acquired on one field, is often invested with an authority that is safe and altogether to be trusted, when confined to that field; but is mischievous and ought not to be trusted, when extended to other fields of inquiry, distinct from the one on which the eminence has been won. It is to the fascination of such great names as that of La Place, who never studied the Christian argument, that most of the world's infidelity is owing; and it is precisely thus, that the name of Dr. Lee, because said to be great in bibliography, is pregnant with mischief, when brought to bear on what he never studied—either the statistics, or the right economical and ecclesiastical arrangements of the present day. One of his lay supporters told me some time ago, that we must make him Moderator, for he was a prodigiously learned man. I will perfectly agree with my admiring friend, whenever the Moderatorship becomes an innocuous honour; but not at present, when the appointment would be fraught with danger—and, that, because the learning of Dr. Lee gives a tenfold authority to those perversities and errors, by which he on the one hand is apt to mislead the Government; and that too a Government on the other hand willing to be misled by him.

But I must now compress to the uttermost; and let me therefore be

such bitter things against me in his printed letter of the 29th of December—where I am held forth to the public and the Church, as the under-ground calumniator of Dr. Lee.

brief in my remarks on his examination respecting the ecclesiastical state of Edinburgh, before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, on the thirteenth of June last. One question put to him is, Whether the accommodation afforded by the Parish Churches and Chapels of Ease, without the Royalty, was very inadequate for the adult population there; and his reply is, "O, most certainly, it is quite inadequate, if one does not take into account the supply by the dissenters." This leaves the examinators at liberty to suppose, that if one does take into account the supply by dissenters, there might be no inadequacy. But, to provide against this uncertainty, the next question is, "Taking into account the supply by dissenters, is it adequate to the adult population?" The reply scarcely if at all mitigates the uncertainty—"I would not say it is adequate." But how is it that at this crisis of the examination, he does not say what alone is essential to be known upon this subject?—that though all the Church and Chapel room of all the denominations taken together, were perfectly adequate to the adults without the Royalty, this was quite compatible with the fact, that, at least, there were twenty thousand adults in a state of entire practical destitution, and that this destitution it was the duty of the Government to provide for? Why make the quantity of destitution hinge so exclusively on the amount of room within all places of worship, in face of the glaring truth, that, from the want of low seat-rents and of pastoral superintendance together, this room was of no earthly avail to the tens of thousands, who were living in a state of utter estrangement from the habits and the decencies of a Christian land? Dr. Lee, however, is so far consistent with himself; for he has little faith in the energies of the parochial system, when brought to bear on the great object of reclaiming these hapless wanderers. But this is tantamount to saying that he has little faith in the efficacy of the Church Extension scheme—the object of which is to plant this system, in all the destitute places that can be found throughout the towns and parishes of Scotland.

But we offer no more specimens of the bad things that are in this evidence—it being indeed chiefly remarkable for the good things that are out of it. Never indeed was there a piece of greater or more downright inanity, of which, as it is now published, any reader might satisfy himself by the perusal of it. If he chose to appear there at all, it should have been to defend the right of his brethren the ministers of Edinburgh; and never, I will venture to say, did any champion or any advocate fail more egregiously, in bringing out the real strength or merits of his cause. There is not in fact, from beginning to end, one essential principle of the question enforced, or even so much as stated by him; and after this miserable appearance on behalf of his brethren, no wonder that in the Report of the Committee founded on the evidence which they had taken, the rights of the clergy, or, what is still worse, the ecclesiastical interests of the people of Edinburgh should have been so utterly disregarded. There is not one word in Dr. Lee's evidence, of the real use and meaning of an Endowment—or of its connection with low seat-rents—or of its bearing on that most patriotic of all objects, the Christian education of the common people—or of the cruel injustice that had been done by the magistrates of the city to the great mass of the parish and plebeian families, whom, for the sake of a revenue to the corporation, they had ejected from the

place which rightfully belonged to them in their own parish churches —or of the manner in which this crying injury could be repaired, but only repaired by the preservation of the existing endowment, or the provision of an adequate substitute in its place. These form the strong points of the argument; and yet, in vain do we search for any one of them through the whole report of Dr. Lee's evidence. And he who made so sorry a defence in behalf of an old endowment, is the last man we should look to for any service at his hand towards the establishment of a new one. The two causes in fact are identical, as was perceived at once by the Convener of the Committee of Presbytery on this subject, and is clearly propounded in his very admirable report* —a document full of light and principle, and exhibiting a perfect contrast with the meagreness, the destitution, the utter nothingness of the demonstration made by Dr. Lee. He does not seem to have the obscurest perception of the perfect identity which obtains between the cause of the city ministers, and that great cause of Church Extension —to which, in his appearance before the Royal Commissioners in Edinburgh, he proved himself so hostile; and for which, by his appearance before the Commons' Committee in London, he has proved that even though friendly, he would be a most incompetent defender.

And remember, gentlemen, that by appearing there and doing you no good, he has done you very serious injury. That your cause should have been so unrepresented by one of your own brethren, is, in point of evil effect, tantamount to its having been misrepresented. You know the use that your enemies made of this appearance—giving out that full justice had been done to you, that one of yourselves had been heard, that your cause had been stated as well as that of any other of the parties concerned—and all this when, in point of fact, not one reason of any force or consequence had been urged in your favour. Now this is the very evil I should anticipate from a Moderator of the General Assembly, who was cold or unfriendly to the cause of Church Extension; and more especially a Moderator who had a taste for holding converse with public bodies and public men. Between a Moderator who liked to give his hostile or even though it were but

* This Report by Mr. Buchanan of North Leith ought to be published—when its contrast with the Evidence of Dr. Lee will immediately become obvious to all readers. The Evidence will be found in the Report of the Select Committee on Leith Harbour, which is to be had from all the booksellers. The following extract from Mr. Buchanan's Report, will evince his ready perception of the identity, between the cause of the ministers of Edinburgh, and the cause of Church Extension—while on the other hand, the entire blindness of Dr. Lee to this identity, proves him alike unfitted for the advocacy of both. Mr. Buchanan gives a foremost place to this consideration—" 1. Any proposal to substitute seat-rents in lieu of an independent endowment, is in direct opposition to the principles for which the Church is contending. At the present moment, the most strenuous exertions are being made, with the view of raising the ministers of the new churches from a state of dependence on seat-rents, by means of an endowment; and here, in the Metropolis of Scotland, it is proposed, if the supposition on which we proceed be correct, to reverse that process, to strip the endowed clergy of their independent revenues, and to place them in precisely the same state of dependence on the proceeds of the church-sittings, which has been so much deprecated, and which so many exertions have been made to remedy, in the case of the unendowed ministers." " Your Committee will be mortified, if they find that the great principles for which the Church has been contending, are as yet so ill understood, and her firmness in adhering to them so little known, as that any party should expect such a proposal to be for a moment entertained."—Report of the Presbytery's Committee.

his insignificant evidence, and a Government who liked to avail themselves of that evidence against us—I should apprehend the possibility, or rather the utmost likelihood, of great mischief to our cause.

I shall end this conference with the Ministers of Edinburgh, by one brief appeal to them; and, if they at all feel the force of it, I am confident they will do me justice. There was, you recollect, an interval of several days, between your hearing that Dr. Lee was examined in London upon your cause, and your knowledge of the evidence that was actually delivered by him. Well, gentlemen, let me bid you recollect what your feelings and your apprehensions were during that interval. Was it, will you tell me, a feeling of perfect security? Were you quite confident all the while that your cause was in sufficient, or even in safe hands? Were there no misgivings amongst you, not lest he should betray, but lest he should blunder your important question? Had even Dr. Gordon no feeling of this sort; and did not all or very many of his brethren share with him in a strong sensation of distrust, lest the interests of the Ministers of Edinburgh should be essentially damaged, by some singularity or other in the statements or the views of Dr. Lee? Well, gentlemen, do me justice.. Are you to feel so for your own local, or your own personal interests; and am I not to feel so for that great national interest, of which the General Assembly has appointed me a guardian and an overseer? Is yours an allowable anxiety for a private and a particular interest? And is my anxiety similarly grounded, but having for its object a general and a public interest—is this, so far from allowable, to be branded with the most odious imputations, and have the stigma affixed to it of low-minded calumny and malevolence towards Dr. Lee? Did you not feel it then, and do you not regard it as unfortunate still, that Dr. Lee should have been within reach of the Commons' Committee, and so in the way of doing you great disservice; and am I not to feel that it were a great misfortune, and that it is my duty if I can to avert it, should he in times like these be placed within reach of the Government for a twelvemonth—occupying all the while the most influential situation, and standing in the position of best advantage, for doing the greatest possible disservice to our Church? It was right and rational for you, during these few days of uncertainty, to stand in fear of the hurt you might sustain at the hands of Dr. Lee; and accordingly in a single hour, the hour of his examination, a mischief was done by him to yourselves and to your families. And am I to stand in no dread of the mischief that might be done by him, during a whole year, to the best interests of thousands and thousands more of the families of Scotland? But I will not affect that public virtue alone is the impellent principle within me. This may have had some share long ago, in leading me to espouse at the first the cause of the common people; but I must not disguise that now, it has become a cause to which I feel all the affinity and force of a personal and most affecting relationship. It has been the fondest theme of my speculations, and indeed of my authorship, for more than twenty years; and is all the more endeared to me by the incredulity and the ridicule which overhung its outset—and since, by all the resistance and rough handling through which it has had to fight its way. The greatest step in advance ever made by it, was when the General Assembly set it forth over the land, with the crown upon its head of their high approbation; and the consequence has been, that,

in the glorious awakening of less than three years, a hundred and fifty new churches for the use of the working classes are starting into existence. It is not in nature to refrain from watching with liveliest interest the progress of this long-cherished undertaking; or not to feel most sensitive alarm at every menacing cloud which passes over its way—whether when it falls into the rude and unpractised hands of unintelligent Commissioners, or when the danger is nigh that a hostile Government in fellowship with a heartless Moderator might destroy it. I understand that, in denouncing the enterprise of the 2d of December, I have outrun the sympathy of those cold and phlegmatic spirits, that know not how to discriminate between the vehemence of sentiment and the vehemence of passion. But I cannot come down to the freezing temperature of the apathy of these men; and must retain my own feelings, and select my own terms for the expression of them—when sounding an alarm at the reckless attempt which broke forth on that day, against the peace and safety of the Church of Scotland.*

My third conference is with Dr. Welsh, whom I select as being, of all who composed the meeting of the 2d of December, the most intelligent and the best qualified, to appreciate the considerations, on which I regard Dr. Lee as not to be thoroughly trusted, in the other great question now pending between the Church and the Government—I mean the subject of University Education.

I have no hope of convincing you that he was wrong, in the measure of approbation he bestowed on the University Bill of the present Government. You share with him in that approbation. Neither of you participates in the alarm of the Church; and the power proposed to be vested in the Visitors to abolish Professorships, including of course the Theological, gives him no uneasiness—on the consideration, that even though this power were exercised, the Church could still stand on her own ground, and appoint Professors to teach her students, though the endowments to these chairs were removed. In other words, he apprehends no mischief worthy of the Church's resistance, in the transition from an endowed to a voluntary Chair; or, if he contemplates the provision of a salary for the Theological Professorships even after the State had cast us off, he sees nothing worthy of resistance in a process, that implies an act of spoliation by the State on the existing endowments of our Universities.

But far the worst provision of that whole measure, in which both you and Dr. Lee have expressed your acquiescence, is the power vested in Visitors to order and appoint the courses of Theological Education. I can imagine nothing more preposterous, or more utterly at antipodes with the whole genius and spirit of Presbytery. The line of demarcation between the civil and ecclesiastical is trampled under foot, by such an ordination. It implies that either the Church must receive its Theology from the State; or break its connection with the State, as far at least as a legal provision for the endowment of Theological

* My premonitory letter which appeared some weeks ago, was too strong, I have been made to understand, for the taste of the metropolis; but a bare caveat would not have served the purpose; and the letter was not too strong for arresting the mischief which the publication of the Manifesto of December 2d, was doing in the provinces.

Chairs is concerned. It is quite in vain to say, that the indefinite power assigned to Visitors, would not enable them to transmute and vitiate, at their pleasure, the Theology that is taught in all our Colleges. They could lay an interdict against the admission of what topics they chose; and, on the pretence of banishing all that is controversial from our theological classes, they could banish from them, if they have a mind, all the peculiar doctrines of Christianity. It is thus, in fact, that authority, by the pure force of its mandates alone, has socinianized the pulpits of Geneva; and it is thus too that, at the hands of a Unitarian or demi-infidel Government, the evangelical doctrine of our forefathers might be proscribed, and, once it depart from the Universities, it, with a new generation of ministers, would rapidly disappear from the churches of the land.

This evil may be somewhat alleviated; but not removed by the modifications which passed the House of Lords, and were supported there by the Duke of Wellington and the Earls of Haddington and Aberdeen. It is not enough for us that the new courses of Theology, originating with the Visitors, shall be submitted to the General Assembly; and thence conveyed, with the observations of that Venerable Court, to the Privy Council—whose office it shall be finally to appoint and authorize the methods of our theological education. This is a subject on which we refuse the authority of the Privy Council, with as great strenuousness, as that of any body of Visitors whatever. These peers, ranging though they do on the side of Conservatism and of the Church, have too low, too Episcopalian, a standard of ecclesiastical independence, for the taste or the principles of our Presbyterian Government. The University Bill as a whole is a subject, on which the Professors of Aberdeen are in the right, and these noblemen are decidedly in the wrong. Should they ever succeed to power, they will find, that our Church, in vindication of her Ecclesiastical rights, will truckle to no politics, and own no Master in things spiritual and sacred but our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Our Theology, in particular, is all our own; and, most pre-eminently of all, that of our preparatory classes for the ministry of the Gospel. On this subject we will obey no mandate, either from kings or from parliaments; nor shall we suffer any insidious legislation to distil the poison of its Erastianism into the fountain-heads of the Church of Scotland.

But we shall now confine your attention to a single passage of his recent evidence, before the Commons' Committee on the affairs of the city of Edinburgh—when Dr. Lee underwent a brief examination on the state of the University, and more especially of its Theological Professorship. I never happen to have seen so many errors of principle in so narrow a compass—exhibiting a condensed view, of Dr. Lee's incapacity for the legislation of colleges. The following are the few questions, all of them contiguous, to which we refer—

1. "What would be the effect, as relates to the Established Church of Scotland, of the divinity class of Edinburgh being closed? There is no danger of the class being closed; and there are many other professors of divinity besides that one.

2. "It is not necessary that the candidates for orders should have attended the lectures of the professor of divinity in Edinburgh, but such attendance at any other University is an equal passport?—Yes, the same privileges are enjoyed by the Universities of St. Andrew's,

Glasgow, and Aberdeen, where they have a complete complement of professors.

3. "If the Town Council of Edinburgh would give no salary, and the professor, had to rely on fees only, education in Edinburgh must cease?—I would not say it would cease, but it certainly would be in a more depressed condition; that is, the professors would. The number of the students of divinity have been decreasing of late.

4. "More in Edinburgh than in other Universities?—Upon the whole they have been decreasing for a few years past.

5. "Throughout Scotland?—Yes.

6. "To what do you ascribe that?—To the circumstance of there being already a much greater number of persons licensed to preach than are likely to be provided for in the Church."

Before commenting on Dr. Lee's first answer, it may be right to premise, that these questions, if fully answered, would have made palpable the present unprovided state of the Theological Chair; and so made out a strong case for the endowment of it. You are aware of the difficulties in which that Chair is at present involved, by the bankruptcy of the city. There has been a suspension of its salary for three years—so that the professorial income now consists exclusively of the class fees, which, apart from general students, who can only be counted on as a temporary and very uncertain resource, amount to little more than two hundred a year.

His answer to Question No. 1. consists of two parts; but ere I can animadvert on the character and tendency of the first part, I must prefix a brief narrative—known to yourself, but unknown to the generality of our readers.

When the Professorship of Church History, which you now hold, with so much advantage to the students and credit to yourself, became vacant by the death of Dr. Meiklejohn, my chief anxiety was that it should not fall into the hands of an ecclesiastical pluralist—such as a minister of Edinburgh, retaining at the same time his parochial charge. I had much conversation with the leading Whigs of Edinburgh on the subject. Nevertheless, the appointment was made out for Dr. Lee; and the circumstance was made known to myself, a few hours after the intelligence of it had arrived in Edinburgh. I stated to Mr. Abercrombie the present Speaker, and Mr. Murray, now Lord Advocate, that I should give it all the opposition I could in the Church courts; and would make it distinctly known to the people of Scotland, that the very first act of academic patronage by their reforming Government, was the creation of a plurality. They seemed to be impressed by my remonstrance against so flagrant a violation of principle; and accordingly, in less than a week, I had the satisfaction of being told, that the appointment was rescinded; and at the same time the honour of being requested, to look out for a successor to Dr. Meiklejohn, who should take the office unsaddled with the duties of another charge.

I found this a task of some difficulty. One very accomplished person first consented to the nomination of himself, but afterwards withdrew. Another of great erudition and good talent, was resisted on the ground of his not being sufficiently known; and I was at the same time apprized of the possibility, that, if no one of eminence enough could be found, it might be still thought better to recur to the appoint-

ment which had been originally made; and I felt the necessity of renewing my exertions, and looking still more abroad for one who might satisfy the conditions, on which alone a fresh appointment was held to be at all desirable. I was aware of your academic habits, and of your being favourably known to the public as the author of the life of Dr. Thomas Brown. I had the gratification of obtaining your consent; and a few weeks thereafter the consent of the Government, to a nomination which I heartily rejoiced in, as alike honourable both to the Home Minister and to yourself.

You will observe then that your own appointment was based on the principle of opposition to pluralities. But it is a principle not so sacred in the estimation of Dr. Lee; and accordingly it is traversed by the very first utterance which I have now quoted from him. It is true that there is no danger of the Theological Professorship being closed; but, without a re-endowment, which the whole of his evidence is fitted to prevent, there is the utmost danger or rather certainty of its again lapsing into a plurality. We shall have no difficulty in finding a minister of Edinburgh willing to eke out his clerical income by an additional two hundred pounds from the fees of the students—when one of the most laborious professorships in Scotland would be again laid on the overburdened shoulders of a clergyman, who must compound his time and his strength the best way he can, between the half done duties of his Professorship and of his Parish.

But let me now direct your attention to the second part of the answer in No. 1—by which he informs his examinators, that, even though the Professorship were closed, the case is not irremediable. There is help at hand. There are many other Professors ready to take up the dispersed students, and the Church of Scotland will still have its adequate supply of educated ministers. It is thus that he can contemplate, without one expression of regret, the extinction of the Theological chair in Edinburgh. The answer is precisely the same in principle and spirit, as, if examined about the ecclesiastical charges, he had been asked, What would have been the effect if five of these charges were closed? A like-minded reply to that of Dr. Lee's would have been, that, There were many other charges besides that one. We fear that his views of College Extension are to the full as inadequate, as he has already demonstrated his views to be on the subject of Church Extension. At all events, I cannot imagine a testimony more adverse to the re-endowment of that Professorship, or one more fitted to justify a reluctant and economical Government, in withholding any allowance from it, than that by which they are informed, that, though abandoned to its present difficulties, there is no fear of annihilation, and that even its annihilation would carry in it no mischief of a deadly or alarming nature to the Church of Scotland.

But to establish this conclusion still more firmly, we have his No. 2—when he tells of a complete complement of Professors in the other Universities. Now this answer of all others convinces me that if the regulation of a Theological Seminary were entrusted to Dr. Lee, it would be placed in most unsafe and incompetent hands. There is not a College in Scotland, I will not even except St. Andrew's, that has a full equipment of Professors in the Theological faculty. My incessant endeavour ever since I came to Edinburgh has been, to obtain the subdivision of my own Professorship—even that Professorship on the ex-

tinction of which Dr. Lee could look without a sigh—and two chairs occupied by two distinct labourers, whose hands would be fully occupied with the work which might be most beneficially assigned to each of them. I would have two men for doing the work in Edinburgh, which Dr. Lee's first answer would leave to be executed by half a man; while his second answer would reconcile the Senators, whom he has been instructing in London, to the idea of its cessation altogether.

I now solicit your attention to the last part of his answer to No. 3—by which he tells his examinators, of the decrease that is now taking place in the attendance on the Divinity Class of Edinburgh. It has no connexion with the question which came before it—and I must therefore consider it as a gratuitous information on the part of Dr. Lee, and volunteered by him for the purpose of furnishing the members of Committee, with a fuller view of the data on which they might fix their determination, in regard to the Theological Chair of Edinburgh, whatever that should be.*

The first and natural effect of this information is adverse to the re-endowment of the class. It gives the impression of a lessened demand for it, and so of its lessened value—an impression which I several years ago and previous to my connexion with the University of Edinburgh endeavoured to counteract.† I will not here enter on the considerations which elsewhere I have abundantly dwelt upon. Suffice it to say, that now there is at least five times the quantity of teaching that there wont to be, being ten teaching hours in the week instead of two—an achievement which I have been enabled to make out, by the division of the students into two classes, and by the appointment of a separate hour for the hearing of students' discourses.

I will only remark, that the attendance of general students on the Theological Class is a novelty; and it will perhaps give the reader some idea of the connection between those two elements, a connection that is marvellously little understood, between the amount of attendance on a class and its claim to a salary—when I state how it is that I might increase the number of my general or non-professional students, and how it is that I diminish it. I have been repeatedly urged to deliver a popular Course of Theology, and as repeatedly withstood the proposal. The truth is, I have ever regarded popular courses as inflicting a sort of desecration on a College, however fit or desirable it might be, that such courses should be delivered by others without its walls—for the benefit of the general public. I am confident that, by laying myself out for a great and popular concourse of hearers, I could double or treble the amount of my general attendance. But not even the loss of my salary will tempt me to such a prostitution; and though the evidence of Dr. Lee, where the informer and the informed seem alike ignorant of the real principle and meaning of an endowment, should be of effect in perpetuating the difficulties of that Class, I will

* Dr. Lee, at the last meeting of Presbytery, stated that this part of his answer to No. 3. must have been to another question that was afterwards withdrawn. I was satisfied with this explanation at the time; but I have since learned from parliamentary men, that it is quite impossible, for any question to be withdrawn, without its corresponding answer being withdrawn along with it. Dr. Lee's recollections therefore must have failed him.

† In my work on the Use and Abuse of Literary and Ecclesiastical Endowments—where I endeavour to refute an error sanctioned by the high authority of Dr. Adam Smith, and by the French Philosopher, Turgot, in his Essai sur les fondations.

submit to the hardship, rather than, by abandoning the strict and scientific methods of a University, make a sacrifice of my professional students, or inflict degradation and disgrace on the great literary Institute to which I have the honour to belong.

There is one observation that is not out of place, and it regards the declared hostility of Dissenters to the endowment of our Theological chairs. Such an endowment comes into direct collision with their voluntary principle. They offer no resistance to the endowment of all the other chairs; but the chairs of Theology, as holding a more immediate relation to the Established Church, are what they have singled out as the object of their adverse petitions to the Government. This very circumstance, one might have imagined, should have determined a sound and honest Churchman to have flown to the rescue of a Professorship, now labouring under a recent disaster, and exposed to the onset of so many enemies from without. Instead of which, nothing could more effectually play into the hands of the Voluntaries—nothing more effectually serve the object which their hearts are set upon, than the evidence of Dr. Lee.

And here I cannot but offer the tribute of my grateful acknowledgments to Sir James Graham, the examinator of Dr. Lee, throughout that passage of his evidence, on which I am now commenting. The reader will perceive the drift of the questionary process that is carried forward throughout Nos. 4, 5, 6. These last interrogations are evidently all suspended on the information, which Dr. Lee had just given of the declining attendance on the Theological Class of Edinburgh; and they at length terminate in an admission by Dr. Lee of the true cause of that decline—a cause the operation of which is felt too in the other colleges of Scotland. It is obvious that, had it not been for these eliciting questions put by a friendly interrogator, the Committee would have been left with the solitary fact, that such a decline had been experienced in Edinburgh, and each member of it would have been at liberty to conjecture the reason for himself.

I have heard from various quarters of the unfriendliness of Dr. Lee's evidence. It is on the unintelligence of it that I would ground my inference of the unfitness of Dr. Lee, for being intrusted with the management of the second great question that is now pending with the Government. If, however, the unfriendliness did operate, it doubtless enhances the conclusion—for if a matter connected with the public weal, is viewed by any man through the medium of his resentful or private feelings, then it were not safe that either Church or College questions should be put into his hands.

I have certainly no claim on the friendship of Dr. Lee, though, on the other hand, he utterly mistakes me if he thinks that I have the slightest hostile feeling in my mind towards him. I have unfortunately stood three times I believe in his way. I have heard that he was an aspirant for the Theological Chair of Edinburgh, at the time that I was elected to it. Certain it is that I laboured with success, to keep him out of the Chair of Church History—not however because he was Dr. Lee, but because he would have been a pluralist. And I now labour to keep him out of the Moderator's Chair—not again however because he is Dr. Lee, but because I believe him to be an anti-Extensionist. I should feel it a proud, and assuredly to myself it would be a most pleasing triumph; if, in the midst of these untoward

circumstances, I could yet acquire his confidence, and a fellowship of charity and peace were established betwixt us throughout the remainder of our days.

But, in conclusion, let me turn for one moment to yourself. Neither will I speak of any claim upon your friendship, but I may be at least permitted to say, how happy I once was in the conscious and believing possession of it,—when every day my college apartment was gladdened by your presence, and I rejoiced that all was cordiality and sunshine in our intercourse with each other. It is the denaturalizing influence of these accursed politics which vitiates and distempers every thing; and which, tearing asunder the fondest of our social affinities, would uproot all sincerity and confidence and kind affection from the land. I cannot believe that every footstep of your present divergency, has been taken by you without an inward struggle; or that you can look back on the years of our former companionship without a sigh. But the seducers must have got around you; and already led you onward from one wrong and hurtful exposure of yourself to another. My only remaining hope is that you are an unwilling instrument in their hands; and that, when your eyes are again opened, you will come to acknowledge that both public weal and private friendship are things too sacred to be tampered with, for all the illusions of a heartless partizanship.

I have fallen short of my design. The holidays are drawing to a close, and so must my pamphlet. There is not time for filling up the sketch that was in my mind's eye, when I sat down to the composition of it. I will only therefore state, who the remaining *dramatis personæ* are, and the topics which I meant to have discussed with them.

My next colloquy should have been with Lord Moncrieff—not because he is a zealous supporter of Dr. Lee's Moderatorship—not because, though absent from the meeting of the 2d of December, he was in effect represented by his son, who took part in the proceedings, and so gave to this transaction the weight and dignity of his name—but because the report of his speech at a meeting of the Assembly's Commission on the Universities' Bill, ascribes to him the sentiment that they who make certain objections to that Bill, prove by it their hostility to the present Government.

The topic I had selected for the more special hearing of his Lordship is a deeply interesting one. I meant to have stated the precise difference between two minds—the one intent on an ecclesiastical object, and resolved on the prosecution of it, with whatever politics it may come into conflict; the other mind, not in a state of conflict with the said ecclesiastical object, but only helping it forward, when its own politics were not to be injured thereby. I would have tried to demonstrate, that, the one mind was purely ecclesiastical, and that to it politics might be a negation and a nonentity; while in the other mind, the ecclesiastical, without being altogether a negation or a nonentity, was yet in a state of thorough subordination to the political. My object in entering on this line of argument, was to have exposed the subtle artifice of those, who have denounced the Church Extensionists of Scotland, as so many politicians in disguise. I should have pled not guilty to the charge; and every body will allow that I had fixed on a very able judge, before whom to state and set in order this im-

portant cause. I had no despair of being able to convict our accusers of calumny; and of making it plain to every honest understanding, that, in the single-hearted prosecution of our object, we no more think of them or of their politics than of the veriest reptile in our way.

The next of the interlocutors should have been my excellent friend Mr. Candlish, if he will still permit me to call him so. And the object of my conversation with him should have been to demonstrate, that there is no personal hostility in the part I take against the Moderatorship of Dr. Lee; and, notwithstanding the way in which my recent letter was understood by many, that neither anger nor acrimony had to do with the composition of a single sentence of it. I think I could have made it quite palpable to this able and efficient minister of the gospel, that these feelings are proper only to the injuries inflicted upon the selfishness of our nature; and that, both philosophically and practically, they are altogether distinct from those higher feelings that are awakened by higher provocatives—as by injuries done to the great and sacred objects of philanthropy and Christian patriotism. I would have told him, that, if it be good to be zealously affected in a good thing—then, unimpassioned frigidity in the cause of the Church, or rather in the cause of the Christianity of the common people, when these are endangered, is not good.* Altogether the high intellect and fine moral enthusiasm of Mr. Candlish, point him out as the fitting individual before whom to order such an argument as this. I would never attempt any such reasoning with the secular and unetherial spirits of the Parliament House; or with those men of square and legal understanding, whose capacity is for syllogisms rather than for sentiments. With Mr. Candlish, on the contrary, I would feel myself in the best possible hands: nor can I resist, even now, to tell him of the triumphant confidence, wherewith I feel that I should have borne all his sympathies along with me.

But the discussion of the matter, if ever again to be taken up at all, must be postponed till the coming round of the next holidays. Nothing indeed but absolute necessity will compel me to take any public part whatever in this question, till the month of April—as my time and strength are wholly engrossed during the intervening period, with the duties of a most laborious Professorship. I regret this the less, that the vindication of myself from the charge either of a political or personal bias, (unless it be urged by our antagonists, with the obvious purpose of strengthening their own cause,) can lie over without mischief to any public interest whatever. Unless I find, indeed, that the good of our high and noble cause in some way requires it, I am not sure that I shall ever attempt the vindication of myself from either of these charges—willing, if no public object is to be served by it, that my own justification shall be postponed to the revelations of that day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be laid open.

The last colloquy which I had designed to have, was with my friend

* This is a very interesting question in Christian ethics; and I know few in the Church who could do equal justice to it with Mr. Candlish. The deliverance to which I feel inclined is on the side of mildness to the uttermost, in the treatment of all private and personal questions; of decision, energy, even sometimes impassioned energy or ardour, in the treatment of public questions. This last is sanctioned by high examples in the New Testament. And it affords a test, which, if applied to the writings of the early Reformers, would serve greatly to reduce the estimate of that asperity or violence which is commonly ascribed to them.

Mr. More, on the question of the best initiative for the Moderatorship of the General Assembly.

The object of this publication will have been fulfilled, if I shall succeed in adequately impressing the ministers and elders of the Church, with the vast importance, at the present crisis, of the views and the inclinations of its public men—and more especially the public men of our own choice. They will recollect that the immediate, the executive, agents of all our troubles in the 17th century, were hireling courtiers, in conjunction with renegade clergymen. They will recollect that in the days, both of the perfidious James, and the vacillating Charles, there was a constant tampering with one or more of the eminent ministers of our Establishment—many of whom they enlisted into a subserviency to their own views; and by means of whom they too often succeeded, both in betraying the Church, and in lording it with tyrannic violence over the rights and the best interests of the people of Scotland.

The two greatest ecclesiastical topics of the present day, are the Extension of the Church, and its entire and efficient control over the whole system both of our preparatory and theological education for the licentiates of our Establishment. On these sacred interests let us see that our own principles are completely and faithfully represented; and, with the blessing of God, we shall be enabled both to maintain the purity of gospel doctrine in the midst of us, and to extend knowledge of it amongst all our families—if only true to ourselves, we present before the rulers of our land, the aspect of one firm and unbroken and high-minded testimony.*

* I very much regret that my address to the Church at large must terminate so abruptly, from the reason already explained.

APPENDIX.

The gentleman whom I employed to make a survey of the Old, or Dr. Lee's present Parish, has completed the same, with the exception of a few families, partly in Hunter Square and partly in the Old Fish Market Close; and the following is the result:—

The number of the families visited was 286. Of these only 25 were less than 6 months in the Parish, 58 from 6 months to a year, 100 from one year to 5 years, 46 from 5 to 10 years, 30 from 10 to 20 years, 12 from 20 to 30 years, and 6 upwards of 30 years.

It should be observed, that the fluctuation from one house to another does not always imply the fluctuation from one parish to another. Each family was traced upward, through the houses of their former occupation, to the time that they came into the parish.

The same gentleman made a run through 88 families of average condition in this poor parish, to ascertain the length of their leases; and the result was as follows:—

[illegible] were yearly tenants, 10 half yearly, one quarterly, 4 monthly, and only 8 weekly tenants. Of the 4 monthly tenants, one had occupied his house 7 years, and the rest upwards of 6 months. Of the 8 weekly tenants, 3 had lived above 8 months in the same house—other 3 had lived 2 years, 7 years, and 32 years respectively—leaving only 2 of these 8 who had lived in their houses less than 6 months.

In regard to Lady Yester's, or Dr. Lee's former Parish, there is one part of it which might fairly be termed the St. Giles of Edinburgh. We mean the east side of the College Wynd, Hastie's Close, and all that part of the south side of the Cowgate which is in Lady Yester's. We believe it to be the most migratory population in the city. Its [illegible] writes me, "I have ascertained the length of time during which 204 families have resided in the parish; and find that of these, 13 families have lived in it for 20 years and upwards. 26 from 10 to 20 years, 49 from 4 to 10 years, and only 52 for less than one year."

The remaining part of Lady Yester's Parish consists of 274 families —of which 13 families have been less than 6 months in the parish, 47 more than 6 months but less than one year, 56 from one to three years, 87 from 3 to 10 years, 36 from 10 to 20 years, and 35 families above 20 years.

Many of the above families, who have lived in their present residence only for a short time have come from adjacent districts of a neighbouring parish. Thus one family which formerly resided 31 years in Lady Hindford's Close, has been only 8 months in Lady Yester's Parish; another which came a month ago to their present house, dwelt formerly in Fairlie's Entry, Old Grey Friars, for 27 years; another which had been 15 years in the Meal Market, Old Grey Friars, has been only 8 months in their present house; and there are several other such instances of recent removals from places thus in the immediate neighbourhood

Again, there are several newly married couples who have but lately taken up house, and these may have been all their lifetime in Edinburgh. It appears that of the above 274 families, only 13 have come to Lady Yester's Parish, during the last twelvemonth, either from the New Town of Edinburgh or from a distance.

The following very satisfactory communication I received the other day from one of the most eminent of our statists and philanthropists—"I surveyed a plebeian district (Carnegie Street and adjacent places) some months ago, for the express purpose of ascertaining to what extent its population fluctuated. The result of my investigations was as follows:—Out of 355 families whom I visited, I found only 4 who had been less than one year, and only 25 who had been a single year resident in the district. But I found that 257 families had been 10 years or upwards—and 60 had been 20 years or upwards, residing in the same house, or the same stair, or the same street, or some street in the immediate neighbourhood."

Printed by W. Collins & Co.
Glasgow.

SUPPLEMENT

TO HIS LATE PAMPHLET ON THE SUBJECT OF THE

MODERATORSHIP

OF THE NEXT GENERAL ASSEMBLY;

BY THE REV. DR. CHALMERS.

The reaction consequent on the appearance of my pamphlet has now taken place; and the danger is, lest, as the controversy thickens, an obscuration might be cast on the real state and merits of the original question. As the time approaches for the practical decision, it is of importance that the attention of the Church should be recalled from any divergency of argument, whether artful or accidental, into which the combatants on either side may have wandered. And for this purpose, it is also desirable that distinction should be taken between a mere affair of out-posts, and an attack, if indeed any have yet been made, on that which forms the main and essential strength of our cause.

And there is one disturbing element, which, if we want to look to the matter in dispute through a medium of perfect clear-sightedness, ought to be dismissed altogether from the controversy. We mean the element of personality. I certainly have no inclination, and believe that I have, no need, to make any use of it, whether for the purposes of offensive or defensive warfare. It is true that a mirror has been held up to myself, which reminded me of one of those distorting reflectors, that, at every successive turn, presents some new aspect of hideousness. I did not recognize my own likeness in any of them; and the only ingredient of real painfulness was, that, out of the number who were engaged in practising this series of evolutions, I thought I could recognize in one or two instances, the hands of one or two whom I had imagined to be my friends. With the exception of this, which however forms one of the sorest agonies of nature, I hope to pass through the conflict unscathed; and can meanwhile address myself to the task which I have now undertaken, in the calm and confident expectation, that, to all the parties in this contest, the hour of justice, if it have not yet arrived, is most certainly coming.*

* I should scarcely have adverted, even thus much, to the personalities that have been mixed up with this argument—had it not been, that, after a retractation on the part of certain of my colleagues in the Presbytery, there seems to be a revival of moral charges on the part of the last writer who has appeared in the controversy. I shall not feel it necessary, however, to take any further notice of these inculpations—satisfied to find that they have already met the fate of all those assertions which are too glaringly and notoriously untrue to be credited. My chief object, in the public avowal which I recently made before the Presbytery, was to lodge with my eccle-

---

GLASGOW:—PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM COLLINS.

[PRICE 6D.] M DCCC XXXVII.

There is one pervading error, which, if fully exposed, would serve to clear away almost all the misunderstanding that has gathered around this argument That which might be enough to disqualify one from being a Moderator, is not enough for degrading him into a criminal. My single object has been to prove the former of Dr. Lee; and, to meet this, my opponents have done no more, with all their instances and counter-assertions, than to disprove the latter. They and I have been working at a very great distance from each other; and the consequence is, they have left untouched the only conclusion I ever aimed at. It is enough for me to have made out, that, on certain definite questions, those now pending between the Church and the Government, and which of all others demands the most unveering consistency both of profession and principle, he has been wrong sometimes: And the defence set up against this charge, is, that on these very questions he has been right sometimes. We are placed in fact at two extremes as far asunder, as are the very highest and the very lowest points in the scale of human estimation. No wonder that their missiles are so wide of the mark—for, in truth, each of the parties may be said to have been shooting at a mark of its own. My endeavour has been to show cause, why, for the time being, Dr. Lee should not be exalted to the highest office in the Church; and that, because he has spoken perversely and felt coldly of one of the Church's greatest interests. Their showing serves only to demonstrate, that all his words have not been words of perversity—that all his sentiments have not been those of hostility and disaffection to a good cause. This last may be true; and yet the first may be true also. The friends of Dr. Lee may be able to establish, that he has not been constantly and systematically on the bad side of the question; but if not constantly and systematically on the good side of it, he is not to be trusted at present with the Moderatorship of the General Assembly.

It should be steadfastly kept in mind however, that the evidence given by Dr. Lee in Edinburgh does not form the whole of our case. There were his evidence in London, and his views respecting education. But the question that has been most debated relates to the import and effect of his depositions before the Royal Commissioners on Religious Instruction; and, now that this evidence is before the world, does it acquit me of the responsibilities under which I came three months ago, for the substantial accuracy of the statements which I then made respecting alleged specific passages, as well as the general drift and tendency of the evidence of Dr. Lee?

siastical brethren, an open disclaimer of all the unchristian motives which had been ascribed to me; and, as far as I am concerned, I felt that every desirable purpose had been gained, when I found, that, after a disclaimer had been made, I met with a frank and general acceptance. I am heartily glad, that the reasons for a judicial procedure against those of my colleagues who had accused me have now been removed; and if it can at all help to prevent the renewal of such a proposition—the Presbytery are again welcome to the most unlimited use of the declaration made in my pamphlet at the first, and delivered in their hearing afterwards, that no imputation on the character of Dr. Lee was ever meant or ever made by me. I have no wish that either the Church or the country should think ill of Dr. Lee as a man—although I do think, and wish all others to think along with me, that he were extremely unfit at present as a Moderator. This question will be settled, I trust, on its own proper merits,—on public and patriotic considerations alone; and without regard to the worthless and wretched personalities which have sprung up in the agitation of it. On the subject of personalities against others than myself, or by others than members of the Presbytery, see Appendix.

I certainly have no expectation of gaining over the acknowledgments of a violent partisan, and more especially if he be at all dexterous in the arts of a legal practitioner. Enough however for any object of mine, enough for my fullest vindication at the bar of conscience and common sense, if the plain and practical understanding of the country and the Church be with me.

Let me first exhibit, in three parallel columns—First, Extracts from Dr. Lee's Evidence printed at Edinburgh, and which were put into my possession about five months ago—Secondly, Corresponding Extracts in the Parliamentary Report—and Thirdly, Corresponding Statements in my pamphlet.

Extracts from Dr. Lee's Evidence printed at Edinburgh, in the possession of Dr. Chalmers.	*Corresponding Extracts from the Parliamentary Report.*	*Corresponding Statement in Dr. Chalmers' Pamphlet.*
1. I think the idea of making congregations strictly parochial, in a city like this, wholly visionary and impracticable, and in some respects not desirable. (Explains this by saying that the rich of the New Town should be brought over to mingle with the poor of the Old.)	1. I think the idea of making congregations strictly parochial, in a city like this, is almost visionary and impracticable, and in some respects not desirable.	1. Dr. Lee told you in substance, that the idea of making congregations wholly parochial, in a city like Edinburgh, was chimerical, and in some respects not desirable.
2. Many of the people are not only changing every month, but every week,—almost all of them are weekly tenants.	2. Many of them are changing not only every month, but every week; almost all of them are weekly tenants.	2. Dr. Lee's testimony was to the effect that many of the families changed not only every month but every week: and that they were nearly all weekly tenants.
3. Q. Would the work be more effectually done if done by ministers of parishes? (than by missionaries?) A. Yes; but it is not practicable to carry it in this way to a great extent, &c.	3. Would the work of visiting be more efficiently done, if done by ministers of the parish? Yes; but it is not practicable to carry it in this way to a great extent.	3. You ask Dr. Lee in substance, if the parochial work would be better done by ministers than missionaries? And his reply in substance is, Yes; but that it is not possible to carry it in this way to a great extent.
4. Q. Would the minister have more in his power if he were to say to them, Come to your own church?—A. One would think so; but a minister feels great delicacy in inviting people to his own church, &c. For some time past there has been so great a prejudice against attempting to make proselytes, &c.	4. Would the minister have more in his power, if he were able to say to them whom he visits, "Come to your own church?"—One would think so; but a minister feels great delicacy in inviting people to his own church when so many others are equally accessible, which they might prefer. For some time past there has been so great a prejudice against attempting to make pro-	4. But again, you in substance ask, Would not the minister be in better circumstances for doing good to his parishioners, if he could ask them to come to his own church? And the following is, in substance, Dr. Lee's reply,—It is natural to suppose so; but a minister must feel great delicacy in asking people to attend his own church. And, in connexion with this, he further, in substance, tells

Extracts from Dr. Lee's Evidence printed at Edinburgh, in the possession of Dr. Chalmers.	*Corresponding Extracts from the Parliamentary Report.*	*Corresponding Statements in Dr. Chalmers' Pamphlet.*
	selytes, that when you come into contact with any other denomination, you would be apt to awaken their prejudices by hinting at anything of the kind.	you, that at present there is a great prejudice against the attempt to make proselytes.
5. Q. But have ministers not met with the answer that the people have no sittings?—A. That is not at present the true cause. It is certain that a great many of them might find sittings even without paying for them, &c.	5. But have not ministers met with the answer from the people, that they have no sittings?—That is not at present the true cause. It is certain that a great many of them might find sittings, even without paying for them; and sittings are to be had in various churches at a low rate, but they are not certainly adequate to the supply of any parish.	5. You go on, in substance, to ask—Do not ministers receive for answer from the parishioners that they have no sittings? To which question Dr. Lee, in substance, replies, —That, in fact, is not the true cause; a great many of them could have free sittings if they chose.
6. In my apprehension the most promising way of enticing people to attend church would be, to establish a better system of education.	6. In my apprehension, the most promising way of enticing people to attend church would be, to establish a better system of education than that which prevails now.	6. In my opinion, the likeliest way of bringing out the people to attend church, would be to institute a better system of education.
7. Q. If a minister were relieved of his extra-parochial work he would accomplish more?—A. That is obvious, but I do not think it is desirable it should be so, &c.	7. If a minister were relieved of his extra-parochial work he would accomplish more?—That is obvious; but I do not think it is desirable it should be so.	7. The next interrogation which, in substance, I shall notice, is—If a minister had less extra-parochial work to do, would he not accomplish more within the parish? Dr. Lee admits the obviousness of this effect, but he does not think it desirable that it should be so.
8. Q. Do you rely alone on an improved system of education? &c.—A. I scarcely would, but rather think that if there had been a proper system of education, the people would not have fallen into that state of ignorance which is so prevalent, &c.	8. In speaking of the improved system of education, would you rely on it alone, in addition to the existing means, as sufficient to reclaim to religious habits?—I scarcely would in the present circumstances; but I think, if it had not been that the system of education has been long inadequate, neither systematically conducted, nor extensive enough to supply the wants of the whole community, I rather think that	8. Another of your questions, in substance, is —Would you rely altogether on an improved system of education? And his answer, in substance, is—That he scarcely would, but is rather of opinion, that if a good method of education had been instituted, the people would not have lapsed into their present and prevalent state of ignorance

Extracts from Dr. Lee's Evidence printed at Edinburgh, in the possession of Dr. Chalmers.	*Corresponding Extracts from the Parliamentary Report.*	*Corresponding Statements in Dr. Chalmers' Pamphlet.*
	the people would not have fallen into that state of ignorance and indifference which is so prevalent.	
9. Q. Would not the active and unfettered ministrations of a parish minister be of importance?—A. No doubt of that. The truth is, that a very great deal of labour must be undergone by every minister, the good effects of which he can scarcely perceive at all.	9. But would not the active and unfettered ministrations of a parish minister be of importance?—No doubt of that. The truth is, that a very great deal of labour must be undergone by every minister, the good effects of which he can scarcely perceive at all.	9. (No notice taken of this in the pamphlet.)
10. Q. Have you any more remarks?—A. No; except that the progress of depravity has been caused veey much by the state of the law as to the use of spirituous liquors.	10. Is there any additional observation you would wish to make yourself?—No; except I state that I rather think the progress of ignorance and depravity of late years, has arisen very much from some defect in the law with regard to the use of spirituous liquors. I ascribe much of the present state of the poor to the great facility which they now possess of obtaining the means of intoxication.	10. The last question I shall advert to, in substance, is,—Have you any other observations to offer?—Dr. Lee, in substance, answers, as his only observation,—That the progress of the people's degeneracy is very much owing to a wrong state of the law in regard to the use of spirituous liquors.
11. In stating these facts, I beg to say that, for my own part, I have no favourite theory to support, and have engaged less than most in my profession in the agitation of some of the questions which have so lately been keenly discussed, not because I think these questions unimportant, or because I regard them with indifference, but because, not being able altogether to agree with those whose general views I am disposed to prefer, I have been unwilling to come into public collision with such as have a most laudable object in view; while, at the same time, they may have adopted views different from mine in regard to the best method of obtaining that object.	11. In stating these facts, I beg to say, that, for my own part, I have no favourite theory to support, and have engaged less than most others of my profession in the agitation on some of the questions which have so lately been keenly discussed; not because I think these questions unimportant, or because I regard them with indifference, but because, not being able altogether to agree with those whose general views I am disposed to prefer, I have been unwilling to come into public collision with such as have a most laudable object in view; while, at the same time, they may have adopted views different from mine in regard to the best method of obtaining that object.	11. He told you, sir, after he had made his statements—That he had no favourite theory to support,* that he did not agree with his brethren; but that he did not like to come into collision with them, although their views were different from his own. * Meaning, I believe, the theory of the Parochial System, which he had before denounced as chimerical; and, of course, the theory of Church Extension, as being identified therewith.

We hope it is fully understood, that the extracts which occupy the first column, formed all the documentary materials I ever had in my possession respecting Dr. Lee's Edinburgh Evidence. I never saw his printed Evidence till after the publication of the Parliamentary Report. This at once puts an end to the charge of garbling that evidence. I had it not either to quote or to garble from. I made a strenuous attempt to obtain it, but was resisted—and by the very party who now triumphs in the slightest variations; and on the strength of which, though utterly insignificant and null as to the only thing I was responsible for, the real sense and substance of Dr. Lee's testimonies—he has had the amazing hardihood to assert, that, after the evidence came to be published, it would be found that I had given an account of it 'directly at variance with the truth.' Let the reader now judge of this. Let him note first all the variations in word between the first and second columns, for which variations I am not responsible; and then let him state, if he can, whether there be so much as an atom or scintilla of variation in meaning between the first and third columns, for which variation, had it occurred or could it now be pointed out, I certainly would be responsible. But let us also compare the second column with the third; and see what the hair-breadth of difference is, between the sentences actually emitted by Dr. Lee, and the sense that we have put on these sentences.

In No. 1. I perceive that the counterpart word to *wholly* in my extract, is *almost* in the Parliamentary Report. It is very fortunate, that, determined to err on the side of moderation and safety, my habit was rather to understate than otherwise; and certain it is, that the statement in the third column is sufficiently beneath the extract in the first, so as not to exceed the strength, or to exaggerate the meaning and effect of the corresponding extract in the second column.

No. 2. There is no other variation than the slight transposition of one word, which does not effect any difference of sense between the first and second columns, and none most certainly between either of them and the statement in the third column.

No. 3. will show on what slender ground the most serious charges have been advanced against me—as if I had wilfully perverted and misrepresented the evidence of Dr. Lee. In my statement the work is represented as *parochial* work—whereas it is affirmed, it was not that but missionary work which formed at the time the subject of the examination. Now this missionary work lies chiefly in household visitation; and accordingly in the second column, which gives the ipsissima verba of the evidence, it is denominated the work of visiting.* Now there is no work more strictly and characteristically parochial than that here referred to. It is a work often devolved on the parish missionary—just because the minister, burdened with an extra-parochial congregation, cannot possibly attend to it. It is that work which of all others a merely congregational minister cannot do; and which is, *par excellence* the most entitled to the appellation of parochial—as being that which only the parochial minister, with a congregation formed on strictly parochial principles, can do fully and effectively.

* It is remarkable that Mr. Bell, with the evidence before him, does not keep by the ipsissima verba, whereas I had not that advantage, having not seen the Evidence at the time. His quotation runs thus, "Would not the *work* be done, &c." There is an omission of the important word *visiting*.

No. 4. I very much regret that I was not furnished with the clauses, which in the first column are omitted with an &c.; but are fully given in the second column. It would have saved a world of invective, as if I had suppressed or kept back anything that was favourable to Dr. Lee. If I had had the evidence before me, I should most certainly have exhibited both these clauses in full: nor would it in the least have affected the substance of my commentary, though perhaps it might have lengthened it. The first of the omitted clauses, "when so many others are equally accessible which they might prefer," bespeaks the unacquaintedness of Dr. Lee, both with the ecclesiastical state of the general population, and with the precise and proper object of the Church Extension scheme. If his parish bear any resemblance to those other departments of the city which are inhabited almost wholly by the poor and working classes, then, at least two thirds of the population who ought to be church-goers are in the habit of going nowhere. In urging on them the duty of attending this public ordinance, we do not need to dislodge any preference from their minds of one church or one minister over another. They are alike aliens from all churches, and from all ministers; and, in operating amongst them as a home missionary by means of household attentions, and for the purpose of reclaiming them to Sabbath attendance, the delicacy, as explained by Dr. Lee, should no more come into play, then, in operating as a foreign missionary, and for the purpose of reclaiming to Christianity the heathenism of distant lands. The proper object of the Church Extension scheme, is, not to withdraw the families from their attendance on evangelical dissenters, to the Established Church; but reclaim to religion in the general, and to an attendance on public worship, those families who are alike strangers to the ministrations of both. The parish minister, when moving amongst the families who are of this description, does not need in fact to encounter this delicacy at all. He might with all propriety state that his object is not so much to gain them over to an attendance on his church, as gain them over to an attendance on any church where the gospel is preached; and he should feel it a great achievement, if, whether they attend upon him or not, they now go somewhere in virtue of the moral suasion he has brought to bear upon them. But whenever this change of habit is effected, they will, in nineteen cases out of twenty, go to the minister who has been the instrument of carrying it. As it is from him they receive their week-day attentions, so, in making their return for these, it is to him they will give their Sabbath attendance. Dr. Lee, by this first of the omitted clauses, shows his misunderstanding of the nature and terms of that proposal which a household minister should carry round among his alien families, when "making inroad on the wretched ignorance and wretched profligacy of his own parishioners." He speaks of a delicacy which not only ought never to be felt, but which the real circumstances of the case do not afford the least occasion for; and he conjures up this delicacy in a way that must be felt by every reader, as an objection or discouragement to that scheme in the promotion of which his friends represent him to be so cordially interested.

The second of the omitted clauses, "That when you come into contact with any other denomination, you would be apt to awaken their prejudices by hinting at anything of the kind," does not in the least mitigate, but rather enhances and gives additional force and emphasis to the

commentary we have made on the whole passage. Though the more proper design of our Church Extension scheme be to reclaim from non-attendance on the ordinances of religion, those who have fallen into this melancholy habit—yet there may fairly be included in it also, the object of reclaiming, not only from deadly alienation and ignorance, but also from deadly error. To recal within the Establishment the hearers of such men as the late Drs. M'Crie or Paxton, were certainly not the same moral achievement as to reclaim from Unitarianism or Popery. The delicacy that would forbid the latter enterprise, is the very delicacy that struck with impotence the ministrations of the Irish Church for more than a century, and which, if acted on by us, would permit the inroads of Popery to any extent into our own land. The truth is that this omitted clause, taken in conjunction with another deposition of Dr. Lee's, of which I did not know till the publication of his evidence, would have afforded a still better ground for the commentary I have given, and have made that commentary still more textual than it now is. He tells us at an earlier part of his examination, that the "Roman Catholic is by far the most numerous sect" in his parish, and he tells us in the omitted clause, of which I as little knew, of the danger of awakening the prejudices of this and all other sects, by hinting at a movement which would imply a change from one denomination to another. We cannot imagine a more strict coincidence between the practice of an ecclesiastic, if founded on such a sentiment as this, and one of the most mischievous principles of our reigning statesmen—or one more fitted to justify the deprecation uttered by us when dwelling on the passage now under examination, "lest the infidel policy of our times should ever obtain the remotest semblance of encouragement from the Church of Scotland."

And here let us make distinction, (a distinction never more necessary to be urged than in this age of crimination and furious invective,) between the effect of a public declaration, and a personal charge on the character of him who makes it. Bishop Jebb, one of the most amiable and accomplished of our Irish Prelates, not only felt the delicacy expressed by Dr. Lee, but actually proceeded on it—regarding it as a becoming propriety in the Protestant clergyman, to confine his ministrations within the limits of his own fold, and offer no disturbance to the hereditary faith of the Roman Catholics. All our respect for this lettered and talented, and we believe pious dignitary, will not restrain us from denouncing the mischievous policy which he has sanctioned by the authority of his name—as that which has ruined Ireland, and brought the Protestant Establishment there, which ought to have been a great Home Mission and Proselytising Church from its very outset, to the verge of annihilation. And neither will the imputation of a personal attack upon Dr. Lee restrain us from affirming that, in this part of his evidence he has embodied a sentiment, which, however much suited to the taste of our latitudinarian statesmen, the Church of Scotland ought openly and indignantly to disclaim.

And there is another discrimination no less important, for the protection of our argument from the misconstructions to which on all hands it has been exposed. Dr. Lee may not be personally responsible for the use which other men might make of what he publicly says. But if what he does say is capable of being so used, if his utterances be of that unguarded or ambiguous description that they might be turned

to mischievous account by rulers bent on mischief—then, whether he participates in their designs or not, it is equally inexpedient that he should be placed in a situation which might give a colour and a countenance to their doings. It is not with any mischief which may lie in his heart, that our argument has to do; but with a mischief that lies in the utterance which has fallen from his lips. It is not with the νοηματα but with the γραμματα of Dr. Lee, that we at present have any concern. He may not be answerable for the consequences which are drawn from his written evidence; but if they are such consequences as might readily be drawn from it by the abettors of an unchristian policy, and such as give a sanction and a plausibility to their doings, then it should be the care of the Church of Scotland, that no such sanction shall be suffered to proceed from the Chair of the General Assembly.

The last omission in the first column of any clause in the second, that is of the least consequence, (for it must be palpable to every reader who examines the two, that there runs throughout the whole an almost verbal and an entirely substantial harmony,) is in No. 5, where I regret to find, that the testimony which concludes the extracts in the second column, was not presented to me in the corresponding extract of the first column. It is the testimony of Dr. Lee to the inadequate supply of churches for the parishes of Edinburgh. But this does not in the least detract from the force of those expressions, which are given by him, both in this passage and elsewhere; and which bespeak, not his cordial interest, but his positive hostility to that scheme of Church Extension in which the Church is at present engaged. He admits the evil; but he differs from us *toto cœlo*, in regard to the remedy. That he should agree with us in the reality of the disease, is surely no evidence of agreement with us, but rather exhibits in stronger light his disagreement with us, on the method that ought to be adopted for the removal of it. His agreement with us in the object of Church Extension, just illustrates all the more strongly his entire disagreement with us in the scheme of Church Extension, in the promotion of which it was, that his friends gave him out to be so cordially interested. The truth is, that if his suggestions were acted upon, the scheme should be in abeyance till these suggestions had the effect which he anticipates; and it is our honest conviction, that if we had to wait for this, we should have to wait for ever. In other words, let the evidence of Dr. Lee become the directory of our statesmen, and our scheme would be annihilated. Our scheme is *at present* to build churches; and that, in order to provide sittings which might be accessible to the common people. But Dr. Lee tells us, that the want of such sittings is not *at present* the true cause; and therefore, however much we might be called upon in some distant futurity to build these churches, something else should be done at present, during which the proceedings of the Church Extension Committee might be suspended. And in No. 6 he specifically tells us, that the people are to be recalled, through the medium of schools and not of new churches. He in fact would supersede our scheme, by a scheme of his own; and if any one part of his whole testimony bids fair for being more readily seized upon, or more cordially seconded by our present rulers than another, we feel assured it would be this; and most gladly would they compensate by a grant in favour of schools, for their refusal of a grant in favour of churches,—thereby avoiding the displeasure of the Voluntaries. It is true that in

a subsequent part of his evidence, which of course I did not see, Dr. Lee delivers a very sound testimony on the subject of a Scriptural Education in schools. I have pleasure in observing this. I never affirmed, because I never believed of Dr. Lee, that he was wrong in everything. It is not at all necessary for my argument. Enough that he is wrong in some things; and that these are the very things which concern the most important operations, in which the Church is at present engaged. And beside this. His being wrong on the subject of new churches, is the sentiment of which a Government opposed to these churches will avail themselves. His being right on the scriptural education that should be given in schools, is the sentiment of which a Government opposed to this mode of education will not avail themselves. They will avail themselves of his sentiments, only in so far as they are available to the promotion of their own views. They will gladly take his assistance, in knocking the scheme of Church Extension on the head; but they will decline his assistance, if he offer to thwart their inclination respecting the interior management and regulation of our national schools. We have therefore only to repeat the commentary on this passage in our former pamphlet. "A Government that should found their measure on this assertion of Dr. Lee's taken in conjunction with his immediately foregoing answer, would be perfectly justified, nay, is positively called upon, to refuse a grant for the endowment of additional clergymen. Their reply would, and their reply ought to be—We refuse churches but we shall give you schools. What the character of these schools should be, or whether they should be placed in any relation to the Church, are different questions; and the determination of which the Government would probably take upon themselves."—Dr. Lee were less to be dreaded under a Government that were sound in church matters; but when not sound, it is not from Dr. Lee separately, but from the conjunction of such a Government with such a Moderator that the danger is to be apprehended.

The last example of an apparent discrepancy which we shall at all notice, occurs in No. 11, between the first and second columns on the one hand, and the third column on the other, and for which I am clearly responsible—the extract which I had in my possession having been very much abridged, in the statement I gave of its substance in the pamphlet. In that statement we omitted Dr. Lee's profession of attachment to the object of Church Extension; and only brought forward his dissent from the way, in which that object is promoted by the General Assembly's scheme. But the truth is that the original evidence serves, far more strikingly than the statement that we have given of it, to put to shame the assertion of his friends, the Resolutionists of the second of December. His agreement with the object, as we have said already, just illustrates all the more forcibly his disagreement with the scheme. There is none, save an infidel, who will refuse his approbation to our object—the Christian instruction of the common people. But still, if opposed to the system of executive measures that we have adopted for the fulfilment of it, he may be our worst enemy notwithstanding—just as we hold the friends of the Appropriation clause, notwithstanding its being the profession of many of them, that their object is to strengthen the Protestantism of Ireland, to be the worst enemies, the inflictors of the heaviest blow and discouragement which can possibly be given to the moral and religious interests of that unhappy

land. Our only purpose, in any exhibition we have made of the sentiments of Dr. Lee, was to refute the assertion made by the Resolutionists, in argument for the perfect safety wherewith the Church might confide their public interests into his hands—even that he was "most cordially interested," not in the object, but "in the promotion of that great scheme of Church Extension in which the Church is at present engaged."

We now appeal to every plain and practical understanding, whether, for all the purposes of testimony, the evidence of Dr. Lee, as published, does not speak the same things, and point to the very same conclusions with the evidence, as stated, not in words, but in substance by us. And when, instead of looking to it in some parts, we take cognizance of it in all its parts, we shall meet with nothing that can neutralize, that can even modify the reasonings in our pamphlet against the Moderatorship of Dr. Lee. We expected, and we said so, that the arts and the sophistications of a practised ingenuity, would be employed to overlay the true meaning and import of the passages that were instanced by us. But we scarcely expected an avowal so confident and unblushing, even from the most resolute of all the partisans, as that Dr. Lee had made it palpable from his evidence that he was a friend to the Assembly's scheme of Church Extension—although after the monstrous assertion of Mr. Bell, that my pamphlet gave an account of Dr. Lee's evidence which was "directly at variance with the truth," we need not be surprised at anything.

But we are told that it is impossible to pronounce on the import of the evidence, from these passages alone; and that the context and connections must be placed fully in the view of the public ere they can be satisfied. But certain it is, that had the context and connections been such as to neutralize the effect of these testimonies—then the *general effect* of the whole deposition must not have been injurious to the cause. Now, of the general effect being alike hostile to our scheme of Church Extension, with the individual specimens that I have given, I was all along as confident, as if I had had the evidence for it before me at first hand. I had the strong and confident impression of many hearers present at the delivery of that evidence. But beside this, whatever number of passages the friends of Dr. Lee might collect, whether from the history of his life, or even from the record of his examinations before the Commissioners, they would not destroy the character of the distinct testimonies that we have now exhibited; and, what is of prime importance, they would not prevent the mischievous use to which they are capable of being turned by a Government, interested in the postponement or in the refusal of our claims. These testimonies of Dr. Lee can be made to serve the purposes of hostile or unwilling rulers, whatever testimonies counter to these might be gathered from other sayings uttered upon this or upon other occasions. If instances of a character opposite to ours can anywhere be found, they will only exhibit the inconsistencies of Dr. Lee; and not that steady unswerving friendship to our cause, which is the only thing on which we can place our dependence. They may prove that he is not wrong always. But enough for the one object that we labour to establish, that he is not right always. The man who is right and wrong time about, is not fit to be trusted with the Moderatorship of the General Assembly.

But, taking a full and comprehensive view of the Evidence now pub-

lished, let us consider whether it be in the least more favourable to our Church Extension scheme than we have already set forth that Evidence to be from the confined view that we before had of it.

First then, in Dr. Lee's evidence, there is no express mention made of the Church Extension scheme from the beginning to the end of it; and certainly nothing that bespeaks his friendship to that scheme as a whole. Certainly there is no proof of his being "most cordially interested in that great scheme" in the entire negation which he maintains on the subject; and it cannot be the fact of his silence which entitled the Resolutionists of the second of December, to found a claim to the Moderatorship on his alleged attachment to the cause.

But, looking more in detail over this published evidence, there is not one testimony which can be construed by his friends into the approbation of any part of our scheme, which is not so modified, or even contradicted by other testimonies, as to make it altogether nugatory. Perhaps the most remarkable example of this occurs in the following questions and answers, "In a parish too large to be visited by the minister, would you recommend its division?—Certainly. Where he cannot accomplish the visitation of the whole people, would you recommend it to be divided?—Yes. You would prefer that to the missionary system?—I rather think so; but at the same time I may say, it is an experiment which has not been tried, and I would not be dogmatical in pronouncing an opinion on a matter of which I have had little experience."* There the incongruities of Dr. Lee stand in juxtaposition, so that within the dimensions of a hair-breadth, we have a passage containing within itself the elements of its own subversion. These two first answers speak well for the parochial system; but, in his third answer, he will not affirm his preference for it over the missionary system. And by noting what he says of the missionary system elsewhere, we shall find that his recommendation of the chief feature in our scheme, either comes to nothing, or is superseded by the recommendation of something else. For turn to another question.—"Would the extension of the missionary system alone supply the deficiency in the Old Parish?—I do not think so. I do not attach so great importance to that ministration as some do, but at the same time I own it may be useful as an auxiliary to the preaching of the Gospel, which I regard as the chief and most active means of leading to the knowledge of divine truth, and the practice of Christian duties."—This would seem as if inclining to the parochial rather than to the missionary system, and more especially as a little onwards, Dr. Lee tells us in one of the richest specimens of his own peculiar and indefinite style of testimony—"I do not know that I can say that I am clear about the system being likely to be so very sufficient as appears to be generally expected." Now in the first passage

* As a specimen of the use that might be made by a special pleader of these incongruities on the part of Dr. Lee, I observe that one of the latest anonymous authors in this controversy quotes the two first of these questions, but omits the last; and on the passage thus mutilated argues for Dr. Lee's friendship to the Parochial System. See a pamphlet entitled "One Word More," &c.—which—however slender in point of argument, lends a valuable confirmation to our apprehension, that Politics have had considerably to do with this attempt to force on the Moderatorship of Dr. Lee. It should be remarked that the missionary system is the great specific of the Voluntaries, and yet Dr. Lee hesitates whether or not he shall prefer to it the system of parochial subdivision, which carries into effect the design of a territorial establishment.

quoted in this paragraph, he is as little clear, whether he should prefer the division of parishes to that very missionary system about the sufficiency of which he cannot say whether he knows whether he is clear or not. After all these ambiguities, of which so little or of which positively nothing can be made, it were extremely difficult to estimate how much, or how little weight should be given to the following testimony—"In order to the minister of the parish carrying on that system of visitation to any extent, is it not desirable that he should have a district assigned him? There is not only great convenience in that, but it is in some measure indispensable, with a view to bring in those who are already not at all impressed with the importance of religious knowledge; but I do not see that it is essential that his labour should be confined altogether to one district, although it is desirable that his attention should be devoted chiefly to it. But is it not necessary that the ministers should work by districts, so as not to interfere with each other? It is desirable that it should be so." He had just before said it was not practicable for ministers to carry on the visitation to a great extent. But even for that extent, which however we are at liberty to imagine as small as we please, he does admit in this answer the advantage of working by districts.

But there is one passage in which we make our escape from these ambiguities; and have at least one decisive testimony, which distinctly tells both to readers and to rulers, in what direction it is that his preferences lie. "Is the preaching station a convenient and comfortable place?—It is fitted up like a church, and quite open to every one, and is exceedingly comfortable, and several people come to it who though very welcome are not those for whose peculiar use it was intended, but persons who come beyond the bounds of the parish, and have been in the habit of going elsewhere. *In my apprehension the most promising way of enticing people to attend church would be to establish a better system of education than that which prevails now* There is not a sufficient number of schools in the city well taught for the poorer part of the people." The sentence marked in Italics forms the basis of one of the statements in the Conference. It accords word for word with the extract No. 6 of the first column. But having had it without the context, as presented by me, it does not speak with half the strength and decision Dr. Lee's preference for schools over the new churches of the Church Extension scheme, that it does in the midst of his own evidence. His testimony in favour of schools, and in favour of them as compared with the preaching stations of the Missionary, is not elicited by any previous question. As it stands here it is an utterance spontaneous and uncalled for—not drawn from him but volunteered by him, and therefore marking all the more strongly not his high opinion of the efficacy of schools only, but his preference of a system of education to the missionary system. Now he had before hesitated, we have seen, whether he would prefer the parochial to the missionary system; or in other words, with all his doubt and indecision about other things, the apparatus of schools is with him distinctly and unequivocally a better thing than an apparatus of new churches, to meet the division of old and the striking out of new parishes. A good educational system according to him, is not only a promising, but the *most* promising way of getting people to attend church. It is of no consequence to be told how good the system of education is, which he would recommend—

how it is the scriptural and not the secular or utilitarian system of modern times. Enough for us that it is his first expedient for the moral regeneration of the people; and that in preference of, nay, in opposition to ours as the first expedient, we mean the expedient of the Church Extension scheme. Let his view be acted on, the only view in his whole evidence which is clearly pronounced and consistently adhered to; and the scheme in which the Church is at present engaged, that in which it has been so strangely affirmed that he is most cordially interested, ceases to be a present and becomes a contingent or a future scheme. According to Dr. Lee, we have begun wrong, and should have begun otherwise. Let his recommendation take effect, and an arrest will be laid on our new churches, till the old ones are filled by his most promising way of enticing people to attend them. A grant founded on his suggestions would be a grant for schools, and not for churches. The design of all the petitions sent up from our parishes, of all the deputations who have gone to London, of all the memorials to Government sanctioned by the Assembly or the Assembly's Committee, would be thwarted and superseded; and, whatever agreement might obtain between Dr. Lee and his brethren respecting the ultimate object of reclaiming people to church, certain it is, that there is such an opposition between his and our schemes, as that, if his took effect, it would prove fatal to all our applications—whether made to the country for building new churches, or to the Government for endowing them.

We at one time thought of appending to this Supplement the whole of Dr. Lee's evidence, that the reader might judge for himself. But as it is voluminous, and a great part of it would be found wholly irrelevant to the question that now engages us, we have preferred giving large extracts; and to the best of our judgment, there will be found in these, all which Dr. Lee has uttered before the Commissioners, that bears, whether favourably or unfavourably on the Church Extension scheme. With these materials before his eyes we think that any candid and unprejudiced reader cannot fail to concur with us in the following observations.

1. Would one most cordially interested in that great scheme of Church Extension, in which the Church is at present engaged, have avoided all mention, and of course all express recommendation of it—and that during an evidence of several hours, and though closely bordering at different times upon the subject?

2. Would he, instead of this, have given forth so many utterances, either of direct hostility or admitting of a hostile application to the scheme? Would he have thrown such discouragement on our attempts, to make the congregations parochial? Would he have so dwelt on the fluctuation of families? Would the work of visiting by parish ministers, have been pronounced to a great extent impracticable? Would he have talked of the obstacles which lie in the way of inviting people to church; or associated the hateful name of proselytism, with the attempt of gaining them over to truth and righteousness? Would he have as good as denied that there was a call for new churches, in order to provide the people with sittings—seeing that there were still a great many sittings, which they could find without paying for them? Would he have so decisively superseded the expedient of New Churches, for the present at least, by his own more favourite expedient of schools? Would he have represented it as undesirable that a minister should be relieved

of his extra-parochial work? Or lastly, would he have made a general intimation respecting his differences with his brethren—not, it is true, in regard to our object, which he pronounces most laudable—but in regard to the best method of obtaining it, the method or the scheme which should be adopted for carrying it into effect? How is it possible to read this list of adverse testimonies, and yet conscientiously affirm of Dr. Lee, that he is "most cordially interested in that great scheme of Church Extension in which the Church is at present engaged?"

3. But these were the only testimonies which I had the advantage of seeing when engaged in the composition of my pamphlet. Of the rest of his evidence I said nothing, though I heard and believed, that, as a whole, and in point of effect, it was hostile to our cause. Still it was possible that there might have been counter-testimonies; and was it not adventurous, it may be asked, to have rested my argument on the passages which I did know, when these might have been neutralized by other passages which I did not know? Not in the least adventurous—for, even though such passages had occurred in other parts of his evidence, our argument against the Moderatorship of Dr. Lee would have remained as strong as ever. The testimonies I did give and comment upon, were in themselves decisive of this question—however it may have turned out in regard to the counter-questions, which might be gathered from the then terra incognita of his other evidence. If they did not occur, the conclusion that he was wrong and nothing but wrong would surely have been fatal to the Moderatorship of Dr. Lee. But if such counter-testimonies did occur, and the conclusion had been, that he was right sometimes and wrong sometimes—should this at all have helped him? Should it have made any practical difference on the election to this high office? If the Church will not appoint a Moderator with the certainty that he would be wrong—will it any more appoint him on the mere chance, or rather with the very great uncertainty, that he would be right? Is the man who is right and wrong alternately, who says one thing to-day and another thing to-morrow, who is in perpetual oscillation from one view and from one side of a question to another—is that, we ask in the name of honesty and common sense, the person, who, in times like the present, can with safety be preferred to the chair of the General Assembly?

4. But again—supposing there could have been gathered from this Evidence, one set of sayings favourable and another set of sayings unfavourable to the scheme of Church Extension—the question is, which of the two would the present rulers have seized upon in vindication of their own policy towards the Church of Scotland? That surely were a curious evidence, of which the Statesmen in London, and the Resolutionists in Edinburgh could have equally availed themselves, in behalf of the respective objects that their hearts were set upon. But to carry these objects, they could not have made use of the same parts of that evidence. The partizans in Edinburgh would have quoted certain passages, to secure the Moderatorship for Dr. Lee; and the rulers in London certain other passages, to justify their refusal of a grant for the endowment of additional churches. If Dr. Lee be really the author of such a two-sided testimony as this, does this either mitigate the objection or constitute a claim to his appointment as Moderator of the General Assembly?

5. Let the understanding of the Church then not be mistified by the controversy which has now raged for several months in Scotland; or by the plausibilities which might have been conjured up on either side of the question. Now that Dr. Lee's evidence is published she has all the materials before her; and she can look calmly and comprehensively at the whole question with her own eyes. In looking to the controversialists she will not fail to observe, that on one side it can be alleged, and perhaps truly, of Dr. Lee, that he in some things is right; but that it can also be alleged as truly on the other side, that he in many things is wrong. Her practical judgment will not depend on the issue of the contest between these reasoners. She will appoint no man to be her Moderator, who is not thoroughly right on the great questions that are now pending between the Government and herself—or who will not give forth a consistent and unequivocal and distinctly pronounced testimony, both in favour of the Church Extension scheme, and in favour of a sound system of University Education.

As this controversy is now I trust on my part drawing to a close, I will bring forward rapidly and in the miscellaneous order of their occurrence, those topics which I either feel most urgently myself, or would press most earnestly on the attention of the Ministers and Elders of the Church.

We attempt no crimination of Dr. Lee. They are peculiarities, and not delinquencies that we allege against him—but such peculiarities as make him a most unfit representative of the Church, in regard to the most important questions that are now pending between us and our rulers. Dr. Lee may have been the occasion of strengthening in my mind, a feeling of the vast importance in the present crisis of our affairs, of having a sound Moderator on the subject of Church Extension; and the perversities of his evidence, I have no doubt, must have made me all the more desirous to keep out an unsound one. These general sentiments, the desirableness of a Moderator who was right and the danger of one who was wrong in his views on this question, were all that I urged on my correspondents in the various presbyteries to whom I communicated the resolutions of the Old Moderators. It may, or it may not, have suggested to their minds the idea of Dr. Lee. For this I am not responsible; but Dr. Lee himself, if his conduct was such as led them to associate with my mention of the essential qualifications for the office, the conception of that gentlemen as one who in his own person did not realise them. My purpose, my sole purpose, was not to depreciate Dr. Lee, but to recommend Dr. Gardiner, and to enforce the recommendation by such general principles as were applicable to the case. I had no personal object in the matter at all; but the public object of having that appointment filled by one in whose hands I could feel, that this vital interest of the Church was altogether safe.

But this is really not the thing into which the question resolves itself. It all hinges on the evidence given by Dr. Lee at his public examinations, and more especially at those which he underwent before the Commissioners on Religious Instruction. Has this evidence been fairly represented in my pamphlet? Does what was then stated by myself, accord or not, with what is now printed by order of the House of Commons? Will the reader look again to the parallel columns which have just been exhibited; and tell me if in respect of substance

there be the difference of a hair-breadth between the account given of it then, and the verification given of it afterwards? Or rather, will he now read the whole evidence as printed, and tell me whether there be any context or connection throughout the whole of it, which can at all modify or neutralize the mischief of those specific testimonies that had been adduced by us? Is not the general effect the same with that which we affirmed it to be; and does it not completely bear out the testimonies given of its import by those who heard it? In other words, is not every reader entitled still to feel just as he did, and to conclude just as he did, on the perusal of my pamphlet at the first? Will he recollect his impressions at the time of that perusal; and then put the question whether, now that the authoritative and documentary evidence is before the world, they are not the very impressions to which he should recur, on the question whether Dr. Lee should or should not be Moderator?

The Church has now the materials before her for a summary decision; and more particularly, will no longer be embarrassed by those scraps of counter-evidence, which the friends of Dr. Lee have collected for the purpose of establishing his cordial attachment to the cause of Church Extension. For, admit the whole of that evidence to be authentic and what does it amount to?—that Dr. Lee is not wrong always, but only right occasionally and wrong occasionally—that he is not constantly to be found on one side, but oscillates from one side to another. Let it not be imagined, that we wish to establish it against Dr. Lee, that he has a faithless mind. It is enough for our purpose that he has a fluctuating mind. And accordingly, while to a deputation of friends who waited upon him, he appears to have spoken what they would interpret into friendship to our cause—to the Commission, when he waited upon them, his words were words of hostility against it. Again, he recommended, they tell us, that some money, which had been raised for the purchase of plate to himself, should be sent to our fund. This is so far good; but it makes a poor set over to that adverse testimony, the whole effect of which were to shut the coffers of Government against the crying necessities of the Church of Scotland. We confess of all these instances, that they enhance our distrust of Dr. Lee, and make us more afraid than ever of his manifold vacillations. It is not necessary for warranting the Church's apprehensions of Dr. Lee, that they are quite sure he will be wrong. Enough that they are not sure that he will be right; or that his is a mind of which no man can foretell the fits and the changes of its future history.

The whole effect of the exculpatory evidence in favour of Dr. Lee, were to establish, that he has not been at all times under the dominion of the same great uniform consistent and systematic error on the subject of Church Extension. But surely something more than thus to raise him above the very lowest of the Church's sons, is necessary in order to make out his fitness for the very highest office which the Church has to bestow. And here we are again presented anew with the character we have already given of this controversy—even that, although our antagonists should have carried their position, it would make nothing at all against the only position that we need to contend for. They and we are working at an extreme distance from each other, and so never come into anything like a real argumentative collision. The whole effect of their demonstration were to prove, that he is not so bad

for our cause as to be its worst enemy. Whereas our object is accomplished if we succeed in demonstrating, that he is not so good for our cause as to rank among its best friends. How very much beneath this rank he stands in our estimation, it is unnecessary for us to particularize. But we cannot fail to recognize the hand and habittude of a lawyer, straining for enough of evidence to satisfy his readers that Dr. Lee should be Moderator, and satisfied himself if he can get as much as would bring off some poor malefactor whose cause he had undertaken. To us there is something ludicrous in the professional cast of their whole argument, and more especially when they try to make out that the animus of Dr. Lee on the subject of Church Extension, was not so inveterately hostile as that he should be reckoned among the deadliest and most relentless of its adversaries. All this to our apprehension savours strongly of the barrister, when he labours to multiply testimonies in favour of general character, or to find out palliatives and passages in the life of a man upon his trial—with the more particular view of establishing, that there could be no malice prepense, and that therefore the verdict of murder should not go forth against him. It is to be hoped that this elaborate attempt will not impose on the plain and practical understanding of the Church; and that both its ministers and elders will deem that the same kind and amount of exculpatory evidence which were enough to save a man from being hanged, is not just enough to qualify for the chair of the General Assembly.*

* But though the observation of professional peculiarities or habitudes is fitted to interest and amuse—it is unjust to lay crimination on any class of men; and I would therefore take this opportunity of noticing a misconception that was afloat at the time, as to the precise meaning and import of what I said at a recent meeting of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, respecting gentlemen of the law—as if I had denounced and proscribed, not one individual only, but a whole order of my fellow-citizens. When I heard of the industrious circulation that had been given to this report, and the use which certain were making of it, I instantly felt, that there must have been, either an unfortunate misutterance on my part, or a most glaring misconstruction upon theirs. Thus to fasten obloquy, not upon a person, but upon a profession, were to be a wholesale dealer in moral charges; and if I have been so understood, I must disclaim it. It were wrong to say that each profession has its peculiar vices, wherewith all or even the greater number of its members are chargeable; but it is not wrong, it is experimentally true—and, both practically and philosophically, a truth of deepest interest—that each profession has its peculiar tendencies, because each has its own peculiar temptations. Now there are the same individual differences in every profession, between those who make head against its peculiar and besetting temptations and those who give way to them. They who yield are corrupted, and in their own peculiar and professional style too. They who resist, by the very discipline they have undergone, will in all likelihood be men of all the prouder integrity, of all the more strict and guarded principle, in consequence. And accordingly, the legal profession abounds in bright and noble exemplifications of this. I have too profound a veneration for Sir Matthew Hale of England; and for Sir David Dalrymple of our own country; and for one whom I do not name because he is still alive, whose ecclesiastical politics I have all along opposed, but to whose chivalrous and unbending honour I have ever borne testimony—and, without confining myself to individual specimens, I have too grateful, too admiring a recollection, of the generous and patriotic sacrifice made in a body by the lawyers in this city for the good of the Church in Edinburgh; too many friendships, though some of them now most cruelly broken up, in that class of society—withal, I have too strong a general respect for this highly lettered and accomplished order of men, ever to make them the subject of a general, and that a discreditable aspersion. Yet it is an undoubted truth, that some do convert the peculiar art and ingenuity of their vocation into an engine of mischief. A professional dealer with

And all they can possibly make out in favour of the animus of Dr. Lee, will make nothing for their object and nothing against ours. Their dim and shadowy proof of what is in him, will never counteract the mischief of that tangible thing which has come out of him —we mean the spoken and printed evidence that he gave before the Commissioners. Whether, it should be asked, will our rulers build on what his defenders say that he thinks, or what themselves find that he has said? Will they be at the same pains to neutralize his adverse testimony, as the Resolutionists of the second of December have been? We must first suppose them to have set their hearts as much on the endowment of the Scottish Church, as these overweening friends on the advancement of Dr. Lee to the Moderator's chair. Will the statesmen make the same elaborate construction in favour of Dr. Lee's evidence, that the lawyers have done; and as the latter have told us that there is nothing in these testimonies of his which should bar his preferment to the Moderatorship, will the former agree with them and say that there is nothing in these testimonies which should bar a grant for the endowment of additional churches? The barristers of Edinburgh are still trying to make it out from the testimonies of Dr. Lee, that he has given a friendly evidence in behalf of Church Extension. But will the ministers in London follow them throughout all the windings of their legal argument; and this for the purpose of extracting from the record of Dr. Lee's examination, not a reasoning against the endowment of our new churches, but a reasoning in its favour. The real truth is, that the statesmen are just as much against the endowment, as the lawyers are for the Moderatorship; and the only real question for the Church to entertain is, whether is it more likely that the statesmen will act on the perverse meaning which the lawyers give to Dr. Lee's evidence, and that to subserve their special object of introducing him into the chair; or will they act on that plain meaning of it, which best subserves their own object, of still withholding from the Church of Scotland the means of its enlarged usefulness to the poor and working classes of our land?

Before finally quitting the evidence of Dr. Lee, we would present and at large, certain extracts from it, which go to prove, not a difference merely in our schemes—but, far more radical than this, a difference in our systems. What we advert to is, a certain sense of helplessness and hopelessness, in regard to the possibility of doing any good to the common people of towns, by the operation of moral causes alone—a sort of general though undefined feeling, that, without some more effectual economy of temporal relief being devised for them, all attempts at the regeneration of their habits may be given up as Utopian—an overwhelming sense amounting almost to despair,

evidence has sometimes succeeded in saving an unhappy wretch from execution, by making out a criminal to be an honest man. But I appeal to every candid and honourable and high-minded individual of that very order, and would leave him to characterise the attempt, when, for the gratification either of some personal ambition or personal revenge, this acquired expertness is turned to the reverse object of making out an honest man to be a criminal. Will the Faculty of Advocates think that their honour requires the vindication of such a proceeding as this; or will they resent it as an insult to their whole order, when a deed so unworthy is spoken of in terms of adequate reprobation?

of their want and their wretchedness, which placed them beyond all rational expectation of their ever being recalled to a better state, till a better pauperism or better administration of it could in some way be fallen on. In short, he appears to belong to that class of philanthropists, amiable and sincere, we have no doubt, but withal not very enlightened, who would give the precedence to the appliance of means for assuaging the ills of poverty among the lower orders, as an indispensable precursor to the appliance of means for the removal of their ignorance, or the reformation of their irreligion and their vices. There is a capital distinction of treatment suspended on this distinction, which obtains between the notions of those with whom the amelioration of society is a favourite object of contemplation—one set for addressing themselves, in the first instance, to the destitution of their physical comforts; another, and we profess ourselves to be of this latter class, for making an instant attempt on the hearts and principles of the common people—believing as we do, not that a larger sufficiency in their means of enjoyment is the first and essential stepping-stone to a renovation of character, but that this renovation of character forms the great and only basis on which the sufficiency and independence of the working classes can be upholden.

So thinks not Dr. Lee; and therefore it is that he would limit our parochial system, to make room for his own. He would mix the people of the New with the people of the Old Town, into general instead of local congregations, for the sake of the temporal good things which the former might in this way be led to bestow upon the latter. I have been charged with suppressing eleven lines of evidence, for the purpose of throwing a disguise over the right and amiable principles, on which Dr. Lee would have the parochial system of the Church Extension Committee modified or broken up. It so happens that till the publication of the whole evidence, I never had my eye on a single syllable of it, beyond what I have presented to the reader in the first of the three parallel columns. But even though I had had these eleven lines in my possession, and all the other extracts I am now to give, I am not sure that I would have noticed them at all in my pamphlet; and that, because I give as little weight to the views which are contained in them as I would to the views of those, who think that it is by the operation of a good poor-law, and not by the efforts of an unabridged or rather an extended Protestant Church, that we are to look either for the moral or the economical regeneration of Ireland.

It is on this principle that I took no notice in my commentaries, of the parenthetic sentence subjoined to No. 1, wherewith I was furnished, along with the extracts in the first column. The following extracts from the evidence in full, will show the extent to which the mind of Dr. Lee is occupied with the temporal discomforts of the poor, to the amount of distrust if not of despair in the efficacy of all other means for their improvement till these are alleviated.

"I suppose that a great many of those who do not attend any place of worship belong to that class?—Yes; they cannot attend without clothing. Their wretchedness is such that it cannot be relieved except by some extraordinary means, different from what has yet been attempted, and no doubt it is brought on in many cases by themselves." "I do not think that the labours of a minister should be confined to one class of persons. It is desirable that in the house of prayer the rich

and poor should meet together; and I think it of great importance that the labours of the minister should be distributed both among the rich and the poor, as he may in this way have an opportunity of directing towards the poor the sympathies of the rich. Much more good may be done in this way, if the rich are disposed to befriend the poor; and they would be disposed to befriend them, especially when they knew they were honest and strict in the observances of religion and the other duties of life." "What excuse do the people generally make? —Want of proper clothing is the chief excuse." "They do not like to be exposed to the gaze of those who are more gaily apparelled; and the truth is, that they really are so very ill clothed, that there is more respect to be shown to that excuse than often is."

The following are the eleven lines with the suppression of which I was charged, and that long before I had come within sight of them.

"When a minister has a parish church such as mine, it is desirable that his labours should be extended to persons in different stations in life, because he has an opportunity of adapting his instructions to all varieties and conditions of character, and also to extend the means of inducing those who are able to contribute to the relief and instruction of others, and provide means for their benefit, which he never could find, if his attention were exclusively devoted to the poor. To give a specimen of this: In one of the subordinate points of my duty, it occasionally happens, when conversing with persons of my own congregation in the better circumstances of life, that I have occasion to speak of the deplorable state of many of the poor who fall under my notice; and I scarcely ever do it without having an offer of an immediate grant of the means of doing them good, which I could not expect to find, if my charge were confined to those who labour under such deplorable circumstances."

We shall now present the reader, once for all, with the main depositions of Dr. Lee upon this subject. "Another subject on which I wish to offer some additional explanation, is the frequent change of residence among the poorer classes. I stated formerly that I had found, in my experience since I became minister of the Old Church parish, that poor families removed very often, not only from one part of the parish to another, but beyond the bounds of the parish altogether. I understand that a different statement has been made by others, in regard to the general tendency of the poor to be more stationary than others. Though my former remarks applied chiefly to my own parish, which I represented as being in more unmingled poverty than any other I had ever seen, and though I considered the fluctuation greater in the Old Church parish, I must say that the experience of fourteen years in this city and suburbs has fully prepared me for what I have more particularly remarked. Having always had much intercourse with the poor, I have long been in the habit of inquiring where they had lived from time to time; and amongst people in such circumstances I was never surprised to hear that, if they had been ten years in the town, they had lived in six or seven parishes. As they sink into deeper poverty, I generally find that the changes become more and more frequent." "In the earlier part of my life, I had the charge of a much more numerous parish than I have now, which was partly in the country, and likewise included a royal burgh containing more than 2000 inhabitants, the whole parish amounting to nearly 3000. I am not aware

that I was charged with being inattentive, and I did not think the labour light; but the difficulties and discouragements were few indeed, compared with those with which I must now struggle, although the population is very considerably less. Besides, the manner in which the individuals of this fluctuating mass are crowded together, sometimes two families night and day in one apartment, leads too frequently to a disregard of all the decencies of life, and sometimes to a kind of intercourse which cannot be thought of without horror." "This leads to another point,—the gradation of ranks in these parishes; a point concerning which a misapprehension prevails in some quarters. In my parish there are several high-rented shops, but the people whose business is carried on there do not reside in the parish, and are not to be counted parishioners in any ecclesiastical sense; and, of the mere residenters who carry on business in the same houses in which they dwell, I do not think there is one who pays so much as a rent of £20, and very few so much as half that sum. In various cases the landlords are as poor as their tenants. Only last night I found myself warranted to subscribe a certificate of inability to pay a few shillings of tax to a person who is proprietor of one or two houses. I know a man who has thirty tenants in the Cowgate, and I am sure that, poor as the tenants are, he is in as great difficulty as any of them. There is a gradation, but it is almost exclusively from the condition of an ordinary tradesman down to the lowest abyss of poverty. Day after day I see the most affecting instances of the extremes of destitution. On one day I had been in seven houses in which there was no bed, and in some of them not even straw in place of it. I found old people of about 80 years of age lying on the boards without even any soft substance between them and the timber, except their common wearing clothes. Many sleep in the same clothes which they wear during the day. I may mention the case of two families living in a kind of miserable cellar. These people are Scotch, and I find many of the poorest are Scotch. They had both come into the parish since the beginning of winter, one from the neighbourhood of Lanark, and the other from Ayrshire, in search of work,—two husbands and two wives, and when I saw them last each family had two children. Since they came here they had two dead, and another apparently dying. The place they inhabit is a cellar, where at noon-day it is impossible to distinguish the features of the human face without artificial light. There was a little bundle of dirty straw in one corner for one family, and a smaller bundle in another corner for the other. An ass stands in one corner, which is as well accommodated as those human creatures. Their wretchedness may be better judged of when I state that the rent demanded from the two families is threepence per week, and even that they cannot pay. The men subsist by going to the country and pulling heath for the purpose of making brooms; and it is a very poor subsistence which they can gain in that way, especially in such an inclement season of the year. It would almost make a heart of adamant bleed to see such an accumulation of human misery in a country like this. I have to state, that when so great a proportion of the people are in circumstances like this, and when they have no neighbours in most cases who can give them counsel or relief, the profession of a minister who has the charge is peculiarly difficult and discouraging. There are many wants which they expect to find the means of supplying through the

medium of the minister, and a greater number than 2000 becomes altogether unmanageable."

Such are the fears and the feelings of Dr. Lee, and in these he is not singular. He shares them in common with many of the most kind-hearted of our citizens. But it is obvious, that, in as far as these are deferred to, the integrity of the parochial system must be broken up; and it were curious to know, whether this infraction of the parochial system has led to those results of an alleviated poverty, on which Dr. Lee would contend for the churches of the Old being made accessible to the wealthier classes from the New Town of Edinburgh. Now it so happens, that Edinburgh itself presents one of the grandest exemplifications in Scotland, of churches open to hearers from all quarters, and without respect to the geographical barriers which mark off parishes from each other. And what is the consequence? Only 727 individuals of the Old Town, having a population of 28,000, have sittings in all the thirteen original city churches—so that the nine churches of this number which are situated in the Old Town, must have a plentiful seasoning of that ingredient which Dr. Lee holds to be so desirable. What effect on the week-day comforts of the Old Town, has this influx had, of wealthy hearers from the New Town and suburbs? Let the description presented to us by Dr. Lee himself, be sustained as the reply to this question; and what an emphatic refutation is given by his own experience to his own theory. Let him rest assured that there is a more excellent way. There is not a district sufficiently large for a parish anywhere, which, if subjected to vigorous moral culture, that culture which no other than the parochial system of a territorial Establishment can secure, does not hold within its own boundaries all the capabilities of its own independence. The supplies of liberality from without, bear no proportion to the relief that might be yielded—first by the growth of better habits, and secondly by a stimulated process of mutual charity within. A more correct statistics and closer acquaintance with the state of our plebeian families, would open the eyes of Dr. Lee to a more hopeful view of that enlargement and elevation, which we trust are awaiting the lower orders of society. It is a great question, whether this is to be effected—first by an improvement in their condition, and then by a consequent elevation of character; or first by an improvement in their character, and then by a consequent elevation of their circumstances. In the order of time, the two may go on contemporaneously; but in the order of influence, or the order of cause and effect, the moral has the antecedency over the economical and the physical. If we are only permitted to go on, and obtain the requisite aid for the extension and the perfecting of our parochial system, we shall, with the blessing of God, soon make this palpable as day; and already do the localities the Water of Leith and Gilmerton and Newhaven, one or two of them on a first and superficial view as unpromising as is the picture given by Dr. Lee, bear evidence to the rapidity wherewith churches and schools, placed in the midst of them and vigorously administered, can at once better the circumstances and humanize the aspect even of the worst conditioned of our families.*

* As we are now employed in attempting to rectify a wrong understanding of our scheme, rather than a disinclination towards it—we may as well take the opportunity here of adverting to a misstatement of certain of our opponents, in regard

And there is one passage in the evidence of Dr. Lee which we shall exhibit the last, as being to us the most interesting and the best liked of all his testimonies; and that because it encourages the hope, that Dr. Lee may yet profit by his larger experience; and, though he be still very far from a distinct or firm adherence to sound principle, may at length come to a better understanding of it. "I hope I may be permitted to add, that although I have spoken of congregations strictly parochial, as being an object that we cannot expect to attain in the present circumstances of society, yet during my late investigations, which have been carried on more actively than formerly, my conviction has been strengthened of the very great importance of a close and vigilant inspection of the people by the ministers and the elders. I must confess that though I have always had much intercourse with the poor, I have not seen hitherto, in so strong a light, the extreme importance of particular visitations. I had sometimes formerly found reason to think, as I apprehended at the time, that many of the hours which were occasionally employed in that way might have been occupied in more promising fields of usefulness; I thought so, because I could so rarely find any beneficial impression produced by the visits I did make, and which I again say were less frequent than they should have been; but, at the same time, I am fully convinced, that while it is of importance that these local attentions should be paid, I cannot cease to think that the Old Town should still be superintended in such a way, as that the inhabitants of the New Town, in whose service many of the people have become poor, should feel that they are under a peculiar obligation to attend to their advantage, both temporal and spiritual."

Having now gone over the whole evidence of Dr. Lee, as far as it stands connected with our question, it may still be asked—whence did I obtain the partial view of it, of which I availed myself in the composition of my pamphlet? How came I to be in possession of any part of that evidence?—and that anterior to the full and regular publication of it. Now, I venture to say, that, but for the application now made of it to the question of the Moderatorship, this inquiry would never have been put—any more than people ever think of wondering how it is, that Mr. Collins published his whole evidence, without leave asked of the Commissioners, and without any complaint or remonstrance on their part. There was no word, in this instance, of any undue liberty with the property of the Crown; and, in truth, we were all made to understand that this said evidence was the property of the public, from the very moment of its delivery. The public were called, freely and universally called, to be present at it. Placards of invitation were issued and stuck up over the whole of Edinburgh. What we are now told was a strict and guarded property, we were then told

to the real cause of the rapid extension of our Establishment by means of our New Churches, as contrasted with its extension by our former Chapels of Ease. There is certainly not one of these due to the change that has taken place in the status of the chapel ministers. The gratuitous erection of our fabrics, along with the reduction which has practically taken place in the amount of the required bond, facilitated their introduction into localities which could not possibly have met the burdens and obligations formerly imposed. The abolition of the bond would lay open to our scheme still poorer localities than those on which we can yet venture. An endowment by the State would enable us to overtake the whole population.

was a common to which all men had the freest access, and of which all men might make the freest use; and that the matter of this said evidence was as little of a royal, and as much of a public property, as is the matter of any Royal Proclamation, after it had been made at the market-cross of Edinburgh. If we have been deceived in this matter, it was by a parade of liberality, which led us to imagine, that we now lived in a season of diffusive and day-light communion between the governors and the governed—the former scornful of concealment, and scattering with generous and open hand information of all sorts without let or hinderance among the people; the latter basking in the glorious hemisphere of light and liberty that was now spread over them. And, accordingly, men went to hear this evidence at their pleasure; and they wrote it down at their pleasure; and short-hand notes were taken of it; and current publication, more or less accurate, was made of it in the daily newspapers; and, what was still more decisive to our minds of the perfect fairness wherewith it might be consulted and made use of, even after conveyance had been made of this evidence from manuscript to print, its volumes lay as open in different places, as do the volumes on the counters of any of our booksellers' shops; and, till this question of the Moderatorship was started, no interdict on visitors turning over the pages and looking into them was ever heard of. As one proof out of others, in the very office of the Royal Commissioners themselves, witnesses were sent into rooms for whole days, where they were employed in the correction of their own written evidence, and where the evidence already printed was lying beside them —nay where one of the secretaries turned over its pages along with them, pointing to particular passages, and then leaving the documents within their reach for hours together. And how could we be aware of any prohibitory regulation, when for months previous to our ever having heard of one, no such regulation was acted on by the Commissioners themselves? The copies which lay with them in their own houses were patent to visitors, just as much so as any other books in their library. In short, after having witnessed such characters of perfect freedom and publicity, both at the outset of this evidence, and throughout the successive stages of it, we were not at all prepared for the phenomenon of so sudden a contraction and drawing up on the part of the Commissioners; we could no more have thought of these volumes being afterwards to be imprisoned in a cell of deepest mystery, with the impregnable seal of secrecy set upon them, than we could have thought of the revival, in our times, of the cells of the Bastile or Inquisition; and felt altogether a revulsion of practice and policy as violent, as if we had suddenly leaped back from the expansiveness of these our benign and halcyon days, to the dungeons and the darkness of the middle ages.

It was during this anterior season of light and liberty, that all my inquiries were made. I had long before heard, in the general, of the adverse nature of Dr. Lee's evidence before the Commissioners in Edinburgh. But from the second of December, when the first public steps were taken to secure his Moderatorship, I enquired more particularly, both into its specific depositions and its import on the whole. I obtained very decisive information from those who were present at his examination; but I wished to have documentary as well as oral evidence on the subject, and my engagements made it necessary that I

should request of others, that they would endeavour to procure it for me. I in this way provided myself with extracts from newspapers, with statements from the Presbyterian Review and other journals respecting what Dr. Lee had either said or done on our public questions; and among the rest, I got a small paper of extracts from his printed evidence, every word of which is now published in the first of our three columns. It was a mere circumstance which prevented me from calling to take these extracts myself, instead of receiving them from another. So little conscious was I of any impediment in the way of freely consulting an evidence which I held to be public from the first, that I requested from Mr. Hope Johnstone, one of the Commissioners then in the country, a loan of his copy; and, during the delay of an answer from him, made application for the volume to the secretary of the board. It was Mr. Johnstone's reply which gave me the first information of any restraint or difficulty in the matter, after which I made no attempt to obtain a further acquaintance with the evidence of Dr. Lee. From the moment I was apprised of this self-imposed secrecy on the part of the Commissioners, I made no invasion on it; but resolved to publish my remonstrance against the Moderatorship of Dr. Lee, with the materials already in my possession.

It will now be understood, that I had not, as might indeed be collected from my pamphlet, the advantage of seeing the printed evidence. Any commentaries of mine upon that evidence, were commentaries upon written or oral informations, and upon these alone. It is not true that I garbled Dr. Lee's evidence, for I had it not to garble. It is not true that I left out what might mitigate or neutralize the force of the specific testimonies which I adduced, for these testimonies were all that I had in my possession; and my confidence in their decisiveness was founded upon this, that I had abundant and most satisfying assurances from various quarters, as to the general effect of the depositions on the whole, being adverse to the General Assembly's scheme of Church Extension. If I had had the whole evidence before me, and had there been any passages in it which I at that time did not know and which would have served to modify the conclusions I drew from the passages I did know, I of course would have made the proper use of them. But it so happens, that, after an attentive perusal of the full and actual evidence now that it has been published, no essential change or modification of any sort is in the least called for. There lies as strong, I think a stronger argument, against the Moderatorship of Dr. Lee in his evidence as now given to the world, than the one presented by myself from the limited view which I then had of it—a view which I did my best to enlarge, for the purpose both of doing full justice to my argument, and of doing no injustice to Dr. Lee. I did my uttermost to see the whole of his evidence; but an obstruction was laid upon me, and that by the Commissioners themselves.

And here we would ask the reader to pause for one moment, and make the comparison between those who have presumed on the openness of that evidence, and those who have claimed for it the privilege of a most guarded and inviolable secrecy. The former, acting on the natural imagination of its publicity and patency to all men, had no other object than that things might be seen in the daylight of truth, that just conclusions might be raised on actual and existing materials. The latter, at once the holders and who aspired for a season to be the mono-

polists of that evidence, were enabled, in virtue of the situation which they held, to accomplish various ends by keeping the world in the dark about it. They in the first instance, if any slight mistake had been committed by those who attempted to discuss that evidence under the heavy disadvantage which the Commissioners had imposed, any one of these Commissioners could lay hold of that mistake and, if he chose, might aggravate it to the uttermost. And accordingly a commissioner had the singular audacity to affirm, of my own representations of Dr. Lee's evidence, that they were "directly at variance with truth;" and laid me under the ignominy of this monstrous assertion for a good many weeks—an assertion connived at, or rather sanctioned and confirmed, by the silence of all the other Commissioners. In the next place, by every additional delay in the publication of that evidence, they could prolong the season of this endurance; and certain it is, that but for the urgency of our friends in Parliament who did their uttermost to hasten the publication, I might have been lying under the stigma of Mr. Bell's rash and groundless imputation to this very hour. But the injury done to myself individually is as dust in the balance, when compared to the injury that might have been suffered by the Church. Under the cover of this secrecy, a secrecy which but for the most strenuous exertions to the contrary could have been easily maintained till after the meeting of the next General Assembly, Dr. Lee was being represented, as "most cordially interested in the scheme of Church Extension in which the Church is at present engaged,"—whereas it must be palpable to every reader, that his were the worst hands to which the advocacy of that cause could by any possibility be committed. Was it fit for the Procurator of the Church, thus to avail himself of the facilities and the powers which belonged to him as one of his Majesty's Commissioners; thus to represent the effect of an evidence which he did see, and triumph over the groundlessly alleged misrepresentation of others who because of his monopoly were prevented from seeing it; and, worst of all, to enter as he did into busy co-operation with men, who, in their zeal to secure a Moderator of their own, put forth a recommendatory document in his favour, which, supposing them only to be mistaken, and without ascribing to them a deceitful purpose, was, in deed and effect, one of the most flagrant impositions that had ever been practised on the Church of Scotland. Yet these are the men who, overlooking all this perversity will try to conjure up a factitious indignation against the venial irregularity of those, who conceived to be public that which the public had been taught to think their own. "O ye Scribes who strain at a gnat while ye swallow a camel!"

This controversy will contribute to the independence of our Church; and lead her to cultivate a more assiduous distance, both from politics and from the parliament-house, in all time coming. She will henceforth decide her own questions, on those moral and scriptural and ecclesiastical grounds which are peculiarly her own. She will take upon herself the regulation of her own matters; and be no longer influenced as heretofore by the cabals of Edinburgh. More particularly, she will not suffer the men of another profession to intermeddle so largely with her affairs. For ourselves we think it fou scorn, that some half dozen lawyers, with one ecclesiastic as their counsellor and their organ, should have been able to raise such a violent disturbance throughout the Church of Scotland.

APPENDIX.

It is only after the composition of my Supplement, that I have seen the pamphlet of Dr. Lee.

The only change which I feel called to make by it, in my original pamphlet, is of a passage which occurs in page 30th, consisting of the first foot-note and of the sentence to which it is appended. The testimony of Mr. Gurney establishes that the information there referred to, was elicited by a previous question; and, in considering it to have been volunteered by Dr. Lee, I am satisfied and I confess that I have done him wrong.

I make no complaint of Dr. Lee's attacks upon myself—for, however it may be explained, I really do not feel hurt by them. But I have not the same toleration for his attacks on other people; and, more especially, on those innocent and deserving individuals who have fallen under his displeasure, in virtue of their connection with me.

I can imagine nothing more unprovoked, and, I will add, nothing more unjust—than the severities which he has uttered against Mr. Malcolm Stewart, Mr. Waddel, and virtually against Mr. Rowand—to whose joint aid I have been indebted, in the work of my statistical investigations. All of them are singularly accomplished for the task, by the practice and the experience which they have had in it—beside being persons of superior intelligence and perfect honesty. I do hope that the hostility of Dr. Lee, and his expression of that hostility, however unpleasant it might be to their feelings, will be of no disservice to their prospects in life; and that their great respectability, as well as great worth, will prove an adequate protection to them, from any injury they might otherwise have gotten at his hands.

Let me here observe, while on the subject of personalities, that although not particularly distressed by those of Dr. Lee, it were downright affectation, it would argue a mutilation or defect in my constitution as a man—did I profess the like apathy, in regard to the hideous charges which have been advanced against me, by other persons who have engaged in this controversy.

I am now pretty well seasoned, by the ferocious attacks of party and interested newspapers, to the onslaughts of anonymous violence. But I confess myself not to have been prepared for such a discharge of all that is ferocious and foul, from men with whom I had long lived in habits of cordial intimacy; nor could I have believed it possible that I should have been so assailed, by any in the shape of gentlemen and friends, and that too in the worst style of the virulence of our age.

And yet I have all along felt an insuperable dislike to the work of my own personal vindication; and, more especially, on the field of authorship. I should have somewhat the same sense of degradation, in sisting myself as a pannel at the bar of the public—that I would have in standing pilloried before them as a malefactor or a convict. I therefore felt all the more grateful, that, what I have not done myself, others have most effectually done for me. The generous interpositions of Mr. Cunningham, in my behalf, and of Mr. Bruce with his coadjutors, can never be forgotten.

When one speaks of being hurt by the calumnies of others—a distinction should be made between being hurt in his own feelings, and hurt in the estimation of the world. He may suffer, and most acutely, in the former sense; though he should not suffer at all in the latter. To be told that he need not care because nobody believes, is not by any means a full or adequate reparation to him; but, on the contrary, it aggravates the injury as done by his accusers, and comes with tremendous reaction upon their heads—in that they have uttered things so grossly untrue, as to have met with no credit or reception from other men.

When I made my recent declaration in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, it was not with a view to any judicial procedure on their part. It was to make myself right with the generality of my brethren—leaving the few who had done me an offence to the spontaneous movements of their own ingenuousness. I had no wish that it should be taken up presbyterially; for what will barely suffice to remove a matter

from the judicial cognizance of a Court, may be very far from enough for the restoration of the parties, between whom a misunderstanding subsists, to terms of confidence and cordiality with each other.

At all events, the extra-presbyterial authors of the Statement, though they did intrude themselves unbidden on the occasion, were expressly disclaimed by me as having any rightful or legitimate part in the transaction. Certain it is, that, with whatever view they may have contrived to edge themselves in, it is but too obvious that it has been attended with no proper effect on their subsequent conduct. This we infer from the appearance of an article in the last Presbyterian Review,* which may be considered as the organ of the combination; and which bespeaks the principal members of it, to be as hard, as unyielding, and as obtusely insensible as ever of the delinquency into which they have fallen.

The abuse begun by the authors of which I complain, has been reiterated far and wide by the adherents of a party in the State; and on this subject, I have but one remark more, that I would leave for the consideration of my brethren. If, because labouring for the good of the Church, and labouring too zealously and too successfully for the taste and convenience of the men in power, any minister of the Establishment shall have had the misfortune to incur their displeasure; and if, in consequence of this, the hacks and the hungry expectants of a revengeful Government, shall feel it the most acceptable offering which they can render to their superiors, that they combine to run him down—what encouragement is left for the services of ecclesiastical patriotism, if neither the Church nor the public will interfere for the protection of such a man; so as, by their righteous award, to clear away the infamy which both the false friends and open enemies of our Establishment have laboured so assiduously to cast around his person, and cause it to rest on the heads of those who have raised it?

Though I think it better that the attention of the Church should not at present be diverted from the main question of the Moderatorship, by any discussion of the moral charges which have been preferred against myself—yet, to throw some light on the origin and history of these, I crave the indulgence of my readers for one or two observations.

I never made the least secret with the supporters of Dr. Lee, of my views and proceedings against his Moderatorship; and, in particular, of the apprehension I felt, lest evil should come upon the Church, and more especially upon its great cause of Church Extension, should he be raised to the chair. From the instant it was taken, I neither concealed from them my determination to withdraw from Dr. Lee, nor did I conceal from them my reasons for it. Now how came it all the while, that they never once, during the whole of that period, even down to the second of December, 1836, when I received their first hint of such an accusation by their advertising it in the newspapers—they never once made the least intimation to myself, of my doing aught that was unhandsome, and far less aught that was morally wrong? I both spake and wrote to them of my apprehensions respecting the great public evil of such an appointment, in the present circumstances of the Church; and never, in their speaking or writing back again, did they suffer one friendly hint to escape, that I was foregoing any obligation which lay upon me, as a man of truth or of honour. There was no attempt during the whole of that period, to lay my apprehensions grounded on the fact of his singular Dissent at the Commission of September, 1835, by any statement of the reasons of his Dissent. These reasons were unknown to me, and in all probability as much unknown to themselves, till they had resolved on the immolation of my character; and, casting about for weapons of hostility, pressed every argument they could find, into the service of an attack upon me. I have a very long letter from Mr. Dunlop, of the 28th of October last, written in answer to a remonstrance, which I had sent to him on the subject—where, though he attempts to redargue my statements and views, there is not the most distant approach to any thing like the crimination, either of the steps I had taken, or of the motives by which I was actuated. This was an after attempt, not made and I believe never once thought of, till they had formally espoused Dr. Lee as their client, and begun to plead his cause at the bar of the public. Then it was that these gentlemen of the law, first begun to practise the lesson which they had learned at another bar; and strained as hard, with the very

* But for this article, the greater part of our Appendix would have been withheld.

same instrument too, to save Dr. Lee from the loss of his Moderatorship—as ever they did in their lives, to save a man from the gallows. Society view it with indulgence, though even the worst arts of the profession are put forth to set aside the testimony of a witness; and that, though at the expense of his reputation—when the object is to avert the execution of an unhappy criminal. But society will also know how to estimate the spirit and design of men, who, to make good an object of their own personal ambition or to avenge the loss of it, could employ these arts to ruin the character of a public man; and, for this purpose, laid hold of his most innocent and unconscious doings as so many raw materials, out of which, by a singular process of manufacture, they tried with all their might, to elaborate the strongest possible sort of essence or extract of moral evil. Both the Church and the country can distinguish between a plain narrative, for the exhibition of plain and palpable facts, with the inferences to be obviously drawn from them; and a special pleading for the impeachment of unseen motives, by men who, resolved to put their legal ingenuity on its uttermost stretch, seem, in abandoning themselves to the exercise of this their peculiar vocation, to have put for the time at abeyance all honour and conscience.

I have heard their pamphlet, as coming from such men, termed a moral phenomenon. It is certainly a very puzzling one—whether we consider the person who is said to have had the chief hand in it, or the persons who are said to have assisted at the preparation of the compost. Still I do hope, that all which is most atrocious in it, may be confined to one individual—while the gregarious influences; and the sympathies of one strong and common irritation; and the determination to exhibit and maintain one unbroken front of hostility, against the man who had presumed to assail a favourite enterprise of theirs, now shattered into fragments and lying a prostrate ruin at their feet—these it is to be hoped will account for the passive concurrence, for let me not suppose an active co-operation on the part of all the rest. I cannot believe of that fraternity, that all honour and conscience are extinct within them; but that, at most, these elements of their moral being are in a state of suspended animation. And therefore, if the General Assembly do take up their case, along with that of Mr. Bell as overtured by the Presbytery of Skye, I trust it will be for no other purpose than to discharge towards them, the friendly office of a Humane Society for the recovery of drowned persons.

The Scottish Guardian has philosophised, and I think very soundly, on the strength of that corporate or gregarious influence, by which a number of men will be led to do jointly, what each would utterly recoil from, if to be done separately or individually. There is great truth in the principle, and it was under the impression of this, that when charging any perversity of conduct on any of my opponents in this dispute, I felt that, by ascribing it to politics or partisanship, I was in fact proposing the most lenient construction, which could possibly be devised for it. There is the utmost distinction between a corrupt and criminal, and a delusive influence—such an influence as lies in a system of opinions, or in the name of a party wherewith the highest feelings of patriotism and all the generous recollections of ancestry may stand associated. It is thus that both Toryism and Whiggism, descending from father to son, obtain a sort of fixture in families—whose representatives to this day think they are maintaining a chivalrous consistency by their adherence to a name, while the thing, on each of these sides, is as much altered and transformed as if the two had changed places. Certain it is, that all history and observation attest, how in politics, men might stand diametrically opposed to each other, and yet be alike signalised both by their personal christianity and their honour. I have no doubt in my own mind, I am only saying what all others think upon the subject—when I say that politics have had a share, a very considerable share, in the movement for securing the Moderatorship to Dr. Lee. In other words, I have said that the magical influence of a system has been at work with some of my opponents; and their retaliation for this, in addition to the imputation which they preferred against me in their manifesto of the second of December, has been to charge me with the grossest moral and personal delinquencies. I do not speak, at present, of the pamphlet of Mr. Bell, between whom and myself there is the utmost contest both of statements and recollections; yet while in point of accuracy it is most flagrantly in the wrong—in point of spirit, I have ever viewed it as a most natural ebullition, and not in the least worse than I expected. The other pamphlet, some of whose understood patrons are now beginning one by one to disclaim all connection with it—after that its nominal authors have been successively discovered and detached

from the concern—will be a lasting monument to the genius of its real author, who directed by his skill and swayed by his influence the movements of the combination; and whose inspiring breath it is that has animated the whole.

I conclude with but one remark more. I shall be very unwilling, and will exceedingly regret, if my accusers shall force me in self-defence, to come forth with documents—the exhibition of which must be anything but agreeable to one of their own number. But when a charge so very material as that of deceptive concealment has been made against me; and when I am still told, that all which is material in the affirmations of the Statement has been left untouched by the defenders who have appeared upon my side—then, should this low work of vilifying and slandering which has gone on for months continue much longer, there seems no choice left, but to come forth with the record of an episodical and yet unknown controversy, in which that particular question has been discussed and brought to a conclusive settlement.

BURNTISLAND, *May* 3, 1837.

Printed by W. Collins & Co.
Glasgow.

WORKS OF DR. CHALMERS.

ON THE MORAL AND INTELLECTUAL CONSTITUTION OF MAN. Fourth Edition, 2 vols. 8vo, cloth, 16s.

ON POLITICAL ECONOMY IN CONNECTION WITH THE MORAL STATE AND MORAL PROSPECTS OF SOCIETY. Second Edition, 8vo, cloth, 12s.

CHRISTIAN AND CIVIC ECONOMY OF LARGE TOWNS. 3 vols. 8vo, cloth, 26s.

SERMONS PREACHED IN ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, GLASGOW. 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

SERMONS PREACHED IN THE TRON CHURCH, GLASGOW. Third Edition, 8vo, cloth, 10s 6d.

DISCOURSES ON THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION VIEWED IN CONNECTION WITH MODERN ASTRONOMY. Eleventh Edition, 8vo, cloth, 8s.

THE APPLICATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO THE COMMERCIAL AND ORDINARY AFFAIRS OF LIFE. Sixth Edition, 8vo, cloth, 8s.

SERMONS PREACHED ON PUBLIC OCCASIONS. 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

SPEECHES AND TRACTS. 8vo, cloth, 8s. 6d.

ON THE USE AND ABUSE OF LITERARY AND ECCLESIASTICAL ENDOWMENTS. 8vo, cloth, 6s.

*** Any of the above volumes may be had separately.